Maxine S. Hayward, Olivet.
Chester C. Scott, Osco.
John E. Holden, Schiller Park.
Randall D. Page, Sesser.
Angus Keith Phillips, Shawneetown.
Randall F. Tevis, Smithboro.
Larry E. Myers, Tampico.
Charles L. Baird, Van Orin.
James C. Thompson, Warsaw.
Dwight S. Leverton, Winslow.
Ardelle H. Hanski, Worth.
Thomas B. Malone, Wyoming.
Raymond J. M. Howard, Yale.
Russell C. Spice, Zion.

INDIANA

Geraldine M. Johnson, Ashley.
James R. Davis, Flora.
Gerald W. Scott, Floyds Knobs.
Harold E. Stroud, Keystone.
Lowell M. Roose, Nappanee.
Elmer J. Glick, Shipshewana.
Charles W. Hudson, Solsberry.
Arch Ralph, Sullivan.
Wesley William Mack, Wanatah.

IOWA

Earl J. Penney, Ames.
Floyd H. Millen, Farmington.
Roy H. DeWitt, Griswold.
Dwight R. Aschenbrenner, Laurens.
Harold J. Millwright, Maquoketa.
Richard M. Fry, West Burlington.

KANSAS

Clarence J. Wassenberg, Marysville.
Roger R. Unruh, Pawnee Rock.
Charlie C. Springer, Prescott.

KENTUCKY

Shirley H. Ashby, Auburn.
Helen Hill, Hillsboro.
Carl B. Marshall, Lewisburg.
Walton W. Buckman, Simpsonville.

LOUISIANA

Dosia M. Hood, Elton.
Robert J. Rossi, Gonzales.
Johnie H. Mitcham, Leesville.
James E. Fogleman, Morrow.
Robert H. Welch, Robeline.
Myra H. Doughty, Tioga.
Eck H. Bozeman, Winnfield.

MAINE

Henry A. Shorey, Bridgeton.

MARYLAND

Franklin B. Spriggs, Arnold.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph H. Nolan, Lenox.
George Treat Harriman, North Carver.
Thomas W. Ackerson, Wakefield.
Cecil H. Evans, West Hanover.

MINNESOTA

Kenneth E. Jerdee, Ada.
Henry Bakker, Jr., Ah-gwah-ching.
Norton M. Sorenson, Amboy.
Ralph Dean Fischer, Brook Park.
William D. Cook, Farmington.
Fay F. Smullen, Le Center.
Ivan P. Twamley, St. Vincent.
Albert Pederson, Spicer.
Wayne L. Altermatt, Wanda.

MISSISSIPPI

Joseph D. Buckalew, Richton.

MISSOURI

Doyle L. Scott, Armstrong.
Harry L. Hibbard, Gilliam.
William P. Graham, Hawk Point.

MONTANA

Russell N. Grunhuvd, Hysham.

NEBRASKA

Charlie N. Umphenour, Harrison.

NEVADA

Florence J. Holman, East Ely.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Carl D. Floyd, Derry.
Jessie G. Thompson, Moultonboro.
Herbert N. Smith, Mount Sunapee.

NEW MEXICO

Rita L. Pena, Encino.

NEW YORK

Doris J. Hammond, Millport.
Warren B. Lucas, North Salem.
Frank E. McGrath, Jr., Port Chester.
Hollis A. Wilson, Pulaski.
Ralph A. Doty, Silver Creek.

OHIO

Paul R. Day, Atwater.
Smith B. Applegarth, Barton.
Martin Marshall Miller, Franklin.
Ralph J. Huff, Fredericktown.
Paul L. Sailor, Jackson Center.
Edward Seymour Ullum, Lebanon.
Luster M. Barlow, Liberty Center.
Frances M. DeFosset, Loveland.
Estella E. Ford, New Weston.
Lilla M. McAfee, Owensville.
Raymond L. Brooks, Plymouth.
Margaret A. Stanford, Randolph.
Philip Milton Tozzer, Ross.
Lester L. Stearns, Sherrodsville.
Kathryn B. Thomas, Valley City.
Helen L. Pratt, Woodstock.

OKLAHOMA

Charles B. Smith, Barnsdall.
Frank H. Hawkins, Blair.
Lora A. S. Workman, Caney.
Albert S. Bowerman, Cement.
Omer Lee Wauhob, Fargo.
Walter G. Enfield, Jefferson.
Harriet T. Howard, Keystone.
Lorene P. Ricks, Manchester.
Ray K. Babb, Jr., Mangum.
Doy McLain, Pocasset.
John W. Henderson, Tulsa.

OREGON

Ivan A. Olsen, Madras.
Bernice I. White, Parkdale.

PENNSYLVANIA

Francis C. Uffleman, Bakerstown.
Thomas G. Nestor, Brownfield.
Vida C. Rodham, Chinchilla.
John G. Davidson, Christiana.
Albert Thomas, Clarksburg.
James George Lindsay, Cochranville.
George D. Headrick, Colver.
Ethel J. Nelson, Cooperstown.
James H. Hulak, Danboro.
Mae A. Kester, East Texas.
Robert A. Bushyeager, Girard.
Victor R. Alderfer, Harleysville.
William J. Stivison, Homer City.
Edmund B. Hebrank, Jeannette.
John W. Aungst, Jr., Landisville.
Bertye A. Boorse, Montgomeryville.
Nellie A. Fish, Nelson.
Marion J. Brown, Oxford.
Everett Willard Anderson, Port Allegany.
Orpha G. Leitzel, Richfield.
George F. Yedlicka, Rillton.
John M. Fox, Shanksville.
Horace S. Glover, Starrucca.
Paul Eugene Ribble, Stillwater.
Sophie D. Scipione, Tire Hill.
Richard Edwin Snell, Towanda.
Noah W. Nase, Tylersport.
Richard E. Sayres, Willow Street.

RHODE ISLAND

Richard M. Stanton, Wood River Junction.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Harold J. Snyder, Buffalo.
Clarence C. Phillips, Jr., Central.
James F. Hulet, Trenton.
Alfred O. Johnson, Wellford.
John Homer Ford, Williamston.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Wayne A. Nelsen, Lake Andes.

TENNESSEE

Eugene S. Mitchell, Limestone.
William Hal Redmond, Maury City.

TEXAS

Ernest H. Butts, Annona.
Joseph P. Hutton, Canadian.
Marion B. Bone, Colleyville.
D. L. Stoker, Jr., Crowley.
Vernon J. Burns, Ingram.
C. G. Twilley, Irving.
Verner O. Salmon, La Pryor.
Billy Wayne Newman, Moody.
Homer B. Copeland, Palmer.
Neda C. Holt, Pyote.
George W. Kemp, Richardson.
Jimmy Reid Simmons, Rockport.
Alda R. McDougal, Smyer.
Ila B. Hulme, Stowell.
Herman W. Hawker, Teague.
Frederick H. Pearce, Sr., Thorndale.

VERMONT

Sadie R. Hamilton, Cuttingsville.
George O. Rivard, Richmond.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charles Manning Smith, Charles Town.
William A. Swearingen, Parkersburg.
Leon D. Rishel, Spencer.

WISCONSIN

Lucille M. Radtke, Embarrass.
Ruben G. Duchow, Potter.
Vaughn W. Biles, Stockholm.
Marcella M. Wilke, Zachow.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 29: 18: *Where there is no vision, the people perish.*

Almighty God, in these days of tension and trial, of strain and struggle, of crisis and confusion, we are praying especially for our own beloved country.

We penitently confess that materialism, as a habit of life, seems at times to have a greater hold upon us than ever before.

Help us to see how appalling and inevitable our loss will be if we fail to be a Republic whose God is the Lord.

Grant that the ideals and principles, the hopes and aspirations of our citizens may be more divine in character, lest we go down in darkness and defeat.

Show us how we may cast off and crucify everything that is alien to the spirit of our blessed Lord who made the doing of Thy will the supreme purpose and passion of His life.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6765. An act to provide for reports on the acreage planted to cotton, to repeal the prohibitions against cotton-acreage reports based on farmers' planting intentions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1061. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of

Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property, or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Gillous Young;

H. R. 1700. An act for the relief of Western Instruments Associates;

H. R. 3679. An act for the relief of the E. B. Kaiser Co.;

H. R. 5355. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the United Foundation Corp., of Union, N. J.;

H. R. 5424. An act for the relief of Thomas Helms and other employees of the Bureau of Public Roads;

H. R. 6932. An act for the relief of the estate of W. C. Yarbrough;

H. R. 7454. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation by colleges and universities of sound recordings and film to be used by them in certain nonprofit radio and television broadcasts;

H. R. 7733. An act for the relief of Arnie M. Sanders;

H. R. 8490. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to rice acreage allotments;

H. J. Res. 378. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim annually the week which includes July 4 as National Safe Boating Week;

H. J. Res. 529. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 552. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 59. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property in the State of Colorado to William M. Proper;

S. 143. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Fricano, Maria Scelba Fricano, Stefano Fricano, and Vincenzo (Jimmy) Fricano;

S. 445. An act for the relief of Maria Sabatino;

S. 459. An act for the relief of Francisco Salinas (also known as Daniel Castro Quilantan);

S. 683. An act for the relief of Chiu-Sang Wu and his wife, Catherine Naoko Mitsuda Wu;

S. 1191. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange lands at Olympic National Park, and for other purposes;

S. 1234. An act for the relief of Benjamin Barron-Wragon;

S. 1542. An act for the relief of Lori Biagi;

S. 1593. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Lesch and her minor children, Gonda, Norbert, and Bobby;

S. 1939. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act of August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1275), as amended;

S. 1963. An act to amend section 35 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to increase the punishment for knowingly giving false information concerning destruction of aircraft and motor vehicles;

S. 2215. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, under Federal reclamation laws;

S. 2511. An act for the relief of Maria Garcia Aliaga;

S. 2816. An act for the relief of Concepcion Ramiro (Romelio) Gamboa;

S. 2944. An act for the relief of Yoshiko Matsuhara and her minor child, Kerry;

S. 2965. An act for the relief of Taeko Takamura Elliott;

S. 2982. An act for the relief of Kalliope Giamnias;

S. 3055. An act for the relief of Ronald H. Denison;

S. 3060. An act for the relief of Romulo A. Manriquez;

S. 3076. An act to amend section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, relating to research on foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases;

S. 3080. An act for the relief of Kimiko Araki;

S. 3129. An act for the relief of Nativadade Agrela Dos Santos;

S. 3136. An act for the relief of Fouad (Fred) Kassis;

S. 3159. An act for the relief of Cresencio Urbano Guerrero;

S. 3172. An act for the relief of Ryfka Bergmann;

S. 3173. An act for the relief of Prisco Di Flumeri;

S. 3175. An act for the relief of Giuseppina Fazio;

S. 3176. An act for the relief of Teofilo M. Palaganas;

S. 3205. An act for the relief of Paul S. Watanabe;

S. 3269. An act for the relief of Mildred (Milka Krivec) Chester;

S. 3271. An act for the relief of Souhail Wadi Massad;

S. 3272. An act for the relief of Janez (Garantini) Bradek and Franciska (Garantini) Bradek;

S. 3307. An act to reinstate certain terminated oil and gas leases;

S. 3358. An act for the relief of John Demetriou Asteron;

S. 3364. An act for the relief of Antonios Thomas;

S. 3478. An act to insure the maintenance of an adequate supply of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus;

S. 3861. An act to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government;

S. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution extending greetings to the citizens of Nevada concerning the celebration of the centennial of the discovery of silver in the United States; and

S. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of the hearings entitled "Civil Rights—1957," for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 642.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SAFE BOATING WEEK

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 378) to authorize the President to proclaim annually the week which includes July 4 as "National Safe Boating Week" with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, of the preamble, strike out "1937" and insert "1958."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE THOMAS J. O'BRIEN LOCK AND DAM

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 12613) to designate the lock and dam to be constructed on the Calumet River, Ill., as the "Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not, I merely wish to state to the gentleman from Illinois that the Republican Members from Cook County, of the Illinois delegation, and the State of Illinois join wholeheartedly in this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the lock and dam to be constructed on the Calumet River, Ill., between turning basin No. 5 at Lake Calumet and the junction of the Little Calumet River and the Grand Calumet River, such lock and dam to be located approximately at 134th Street, authorized as one of the structures to replace the Blue Island lock and dam, by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, shall be known and designated hereafter as the "Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam." Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such lock and dam are referred to shall be held to refer to such lock and dam as the "Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is most gratifying to the members of the Illinois delegation, and I know our feeling is shared by every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle, to know that through all the years of the future the name of our beloved dean will live on, reminding succeeding generations when Cal-Sag is one of the great waterways for world commerce, of the outstanding statesman without whose tireless effort and matchless popularity with

his colleagues the Cal-Sag development might have remained stagnant. It is most appropriate that this dam should bear the proud and honorable name of THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, and the fact that the bill of authorization was no sooner introduced by our colleague from Chicago [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] than with the blessing of the leadership on both sides it was immediately brought up and passed by unanimous vote, speaks volumes of the regard and affection in which TOM O'BRIEN is held.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague in support of H. R. 12613. This bill would designate the lock and dam to be constructed on the Calumet River near Chicago as the Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam in tribute to the eminent and beloved dean of the Illinois Congressional delegation.

It is most appropriate that the House take this action. Our great metropolis on Lake Michigan owes much to the statesmanship and farsighted vision of the gentleman from Illinois, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN. He has served the people of Chicago well and faithfully as their representative in the Illinois General Assembly, sheriff of Cook County, and a Member of Congress for 11 terms.

The Cal-Sag channel, a vital transportation link between the Mississippi River Valley and the St. Lawrence seaway, has become a reality through his efforts. Bestowing his great name on one of the principal features of this waterway is a means by which Congress, in small measure, can reward the gentleman from Illinois, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, for his many years of public service.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is pleasing to note the reception by the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle to my request for unanimous consideration of H. R. 12613 which would designate the lock and dam to be constructed on the Calumet River in Illinois as the Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam.

This is a tribute to the gentleman from Illinois, the beloved dean of the Illinois Democratic delegation in the House and among the ranking members of the entire Illinois delegation. It is a tribute not only from his colleagues in the Chicago area but throughout the State of Illinois and likewise a tribute to him from all the Members of the House from every section of the country. TOM O'BRIEN is held in the highest esteem by every Member in the House of Representatives.

While this particular tribute is in recognition of the splendid leadership he gave on the Calumet-Sag Channel improvement project, it also gives testimony from his colleagues as to their feeling for the gentleman from Chicago.

TOM O'BRIEN never seeks the spotlight for the good he accomplishes in the service to his State and Nation, but his efforts cannot go unnoticed by his colleagues who are so familiar with his qualities for leadership. His quiet influence within his own delegation is reflected in his many accomplishments and achievements as a Member of this House. He is respected and honored by all who have the privilege of following his activities.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my colleague from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] in his very thoughtful and well deserved resolution to name lock No. 5 of the Cal-Sag project the Thomas J. O'Brien lock. Certainly no man ever deserved such recognition, for it was only the determined and persevering effort of the dean of the Illinois delegation which brought success to the Cal-Sag project. But the Cal-Sag project, important as it is to the people of Chicago and of the State of Illinois, is but one of the many examples of the essential work brought to fruition through the efforts of Congressman O'BRIEN.

Quiet in his way, there is no one in the Congress who is more effective or more dynamic in attaining his objectives. His efforts over the years have received the high commendation and support of his constituents who recognize the excellence of the representation he has given.

I look forward to joining my colleagues of the Illinois delegation in participating in the ceremonies which formally designate the lock as the Thomas J. O'Brien lock.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10746) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statemcnt are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1757)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10746) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 17, 32, and 33.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 19, 23, 24, 25, 31, and 34, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,190,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$58,139,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$26,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$75,107,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,678,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,720,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$26,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 14, 18, and 22.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
A. D. SIEMINSKI,
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
HAMER H. BUDGE,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10746) making ap-

propriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Departmental offices

Office of Saline Water

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $825,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $785,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Oil and Gas

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $525,000 instead of $550,000 as proposed by the Senate and $500,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $2,800,000 instead of $2,825,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Acquisition of Strategic Minerals

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $3,200,000 as proposed by the Senate to continue the acquisition of asbestos and fluorspar to December 31, 1958, under the provisions of Public Law 733, 84th Congress.

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 5: Inserts language proposed by the Senate to conform with the authorizing legislation.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $22,190,000 for management of lands and resources instead of $22,940,000 as proposed by the Senate and $20,940,000 as proposed by the House. Of the increase provided over the House bill $250,000 is for strengthening fire control operations in Alaska and $500,000 is for the weed-control program on public lands including adequate funds to take immediate action to reseed those areas in Idaho that are serving as host plants for the beet leafhopper.

Amendments Nos. 7, 8, and 9: Insert language proposed by the Senate to conform with the authorizing legislation.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $4,685,000 for construction as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,435,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $58,139,000 for education and welfare services instead of $58,809,000 as proposed by the Senate and $57,469,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $18,100,000 for resources management as proposed by the Senate instead of $17,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $26,000,000 for construction instead of $40,571,000 as proposed by the Senate and $13,800,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill shall be applied to the items listed in the Senate report.

Amendment No. 14: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insert language making available not to exceed $12,000 for payment to the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission for the construction of culverts at Zeibaugh Pass, N. Dak. The conferees are in agreement that this amount shall be matched with a like amount by the State to provide a total of $24,000 for the project.

Geological Survey

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Appropriate $36,915,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $36,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Permits purchase of 92 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the House instead of 112 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $14,632,000 for management and protection as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $12,175,000 for maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities instead of $12,750,000 as proposed by the Senate and $11,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $20,000,000 for construction instead of $24,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $12,400,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill shall be applied to the items listed in the Senate report.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in disagreement.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $11,616,000 for management and investigations of resources as proposed by the Senate instead of $11,508,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $3,929,350 for construction as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,458,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Territories

Alaska public works

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $5,300,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $75,107,000 for forest land management instead of $81,357,000 as proposed by the Senate and $68,857,000 as proposed by the House. The portion of the increase over the House bill allocated to structural improvements shall be applied primarily to facilities for other than employee housing. The increase allowed includes $250,000 for additional forest fire protection in southern California.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $15,678,000 for forest research instead of $16,728,000 as proposed by the Senate and $12,128,000 as proposed by the House. Of the increase provided over the House bill $2,500,000 is for the construction of research facilities as itemized in the Senate report. The conferees are in agreement that proper attention should be given to the Dutch elm disease problem in cooperation with the Agricultural Research Service. None of the increase above the House bill is for the Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wis.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $12,720,000 for State and private forestry cooperation instead of $13,245,000 as proposed by the Senate and $12,195,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Provides a limitation of $100,000 for the acquisition of sites instead of $150,000 as proposed by the Senate and $50,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $26 million for forest roads and trails instead of $27 million as proposed by the Senate and $23,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 31: Inserts language proposed by the Senate providing that these funds may be used for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authority in the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958. It is the intent of the conferees of both Houses that the amount appropriated herein shall be used solely for liquidation of obligations incurred under such contract authority.

Amendment No. 32: Deletes language inserted by the Senate appropriating $500,000 for assistance to States for tree planting under section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Amendment No. 33: Deletes language inserted by the Senate appropriating $300,000 for acquisition of lands for the Superior National Forest.

Amendment No. 34: Eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, language limitation on the cost of buildings and improvements.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
A. D. SIEMINSKI,
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
HAMER H. BUDGE,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 8, line 16, insert "of which not to exceed $12,000 may be paid to the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission for the construction of culverts at Zeibaugh Pass, N. Dak."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection. I only wish to say this, that the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate came to full agreement on this bill in conference, and hence there is no disagreement whatever on any item.

I think it should be said, also, that the appropriation made in this bill for the Department of the Interior is $548,150 less than was appropriated for the Department last year. The conference report, I am sure, will meet with the approval of all of the Members of this House, and I am sure it will of the Senate, and I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], for the fine job that he has done, as well as the staff and every other member of the committee. We had splendid hearings and the bill speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 14, line 1, insert:

"CONSTRUCTION

"For the construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, to remain available until expended, $1,719,000."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 16, line 16, insert ", of which not to exceed $135,000 shall be available for the construction of additional school facilities at Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference action provides a total of $459,675,950 for fiscal year 1959 for the Department of the Interior and related agencies including the Forest Service. This represents a reduction of $30,241,000 from the amount proposed by the Senate for 1959 and a decrease of $548,150 from appropriations to date for the current fiscal year.

Although the bill represents an increase of $45,191,340 over the budget estimate and $46,530,350 over the House bill it should be noted that the budget request on which the House action was based was formulated last fall under the budget policy of curtailing nondefense expenditures to the greatest extent possible. Large amounts of the 1958 appropriations were placed in reserve in an effort to hold down expenditures, especially on construction programs. The 1959 budget assumed that to a large extent these reserves would be carried forward for use in 1959 thus reducing the new appropriations required.

Since the House action in February, these reserves have been released by the Budget Bureau for use during the remainder of the current fiscal year to accelerate Federal expenditures in the light of current economic conditions.

Because of the need to expand job opportunities immediately the House conferees have accepted those portions of the Senate increases which it is believed can be efficiently undertaken in 1959 and which will provide for construction of a limited number of long-deferred facilities urgently needed for various management and research programs. Major increases agreed to over the House bill include $12,200,000 to provide essential education facilities for Indian children, $7,600,000 for construction in the national parks, $2,471,350 for additional fish and wildlife facilities, $1,300,000 for Alaska public works, and $12,175,000 for the United States Forest Service, including recreation and public use, structural improvements, and forest research including $2,500,000 for construction of research facilities.

It should be noted that the amount provided in the bill is $548,150 below 1958 appropriations. Increases in the bill over 1958, totaling $28,856,000 have been more than offset by decreases in several items totaling $29,404,150. This is in accordance with the committee's efforts to hold operating expenses to the minimum required to carry out an effective program for the conservation and proper utilization of our great natural resources

Mr. Speaker, following is a summary comparison of the figures in the bill:

1958 appropriations	[1] $460,224,100
1959 budget estimate	414,484,600
1959 House bill	413,145,600
1959 Senate bill	489,916,950
1959 conference bill	459,675,950

Conference action compared with:

1958 appropriations	−548,150
1959 budget estimate	+45,191,340
1959 House bill	+46,530,350
1959 Senate bill	−30,241,000

[1] Includes $3,974,500 appropriated in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1958.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

POSTAL RATES AND POSTAL PAY

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 573, Rept. No. 1762), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill H. R. 5836, to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the conference report are hereby waived.

POSTAL RATES AND POSTAL PAY

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 573 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill H. R. 5836, to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the conference report are hereby waived.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I hereby present the rule calling for consideration H. R. 5836, the postal pay conference report.

This has been long delayed legislation. Unfortunately the postal-pay legislation passed by the House last session was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

The cost of living has increased greatly since the postal workers received their last pay increase. In fact the newspapers this morning announce the 15th successive monthly increase in the cost of living. The industrial Calumet region of Indiana, which I represent, has the same high cost of living yardstick as the adjoining Chicago area. Over 52 percent of the postal employees in my area have been compelled to seek additional employment or secure part-time work for their wives.

I do not agree with all the provisions of this bill but want to congratulate the conference committee from the House and Senate for compromising their differences so to present a bill which the President will sign.

The postal employees have waited long and with great sacrifice for a necessary raise in pay. I am happy that the pay feature of the legislation is retroactive to January 1, 1958. I hope the conference report is adopted unanimously.

I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the conferees on bringing this bill back to the House. I am particularly pleased because it shows that there is financial responsibility upon the part of the Congress to raise the rates in order to take care of the large postal deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5836), to readjust postal rates and to establish a Congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. MURRAY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be considered as read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1760)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5836 entitled "An Act to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—POSTAL POLICY

"Short title

"SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the 'Postal Policy Act of 1958.'

"Findings

"SEC. 102. The Congress hereby finds that—

"(1) the postal establishment was created to unite more closely the American people, to promote the general welfare, and to advance the national economy;

"(2) the postal establishment has been extended and enlarged through the years into a nationwide network of services and facilities for the communication of intelligence, the dissemination of information, the advancement of education and culture, and the

distribution of articles of commerce and industry. Furthermore, the Congress has encouraged the use of these broadening services and facilities through reasonable and, in many cases, special postal rates;

"(3) the development and expansion of these several elements of postal service, under the authorization by the Congress, have been the impelling force in the origin and growth of many and varied business, commercial, and industrial enterprises which contribute materially to the national economy and the public welfare and which depend upon the continuance of these elements of postal service;

"(4) historically and as a matter of public policy there have evolved, in the operations of the postal establishment authorized by the Congress, certain recognized and accepted relationships among the several classes of mail. It is clear, from the continued expansion of the postal service and from the continued encouragement by the Congress of the most widespread use thereof, that the postal establishment performs many functions and offers its facilities to many users on a basis which can only be justified as being in the interest of the national welfare;

"(5) while the postal establishment, as all other Government agencies, should be operated in an efficient manner, it clearly is not a business enterprise conducted for profit or for raising general funds, and it would be an unfair burden upon any particular user or class of users of the mails to compel them to bear the expenses incurred by reason of special rate considerations granted or facilities provided to other users of the mails, or to underwrite those expenses incurred by the postal establishment for services of a nonpostal nature; and

"(6) the public interest and the increasing complexity of the social and economic fabric of the Nation require an immediate, clear, and affirmative declaration of congressional policy with respect to the activities of the postal establishment including those of a public service nature as the basis for the creation and maintenance of a sound and equitable postal-rate structure which will assure efficient service, produce adequate postal revenues, and stand the test of time.

"Declaration of policy

"SEC. 103. (a) The Congress hereby emphasizes, reaffirms, and restates its function under the Constitution of the United States of forming postal policy.

"(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, as set forth in this title—

"(1) that the post office is a public service;

"(2) to provide a more stable basis for the postal-rate structure through the establishment of general principles, standards, and related requirements with respect to the determination and allocation of postal revenues and expenses; and

"(3) in accordance with these general principles, standards, and related requirements, to provide a means by which the postal-rate structure may be fixed and adjusted by action of the Congress, from time to time, as the public interest may require, in the light of periodic reviews of the postal-rate structure, periodic studies and surveys of expenses and revenues, and periodic reports, required to be made by the Postmaster General as provided by section 105 of this title.

"(c) The general principles, standards, and related requirements referred to in subsection (b) of this section are as follows:

"(1) In the determination and adjustment of the postal-rate structure, due consideration should be given to—

"(A) the preservation of the inherent advantages of the postal service in the promotion of social, cultural, intellectual, and commercial intercourse among the people of the United States;

"(B) the development and maintenance of a postal service adapted to the present needs, and adaptable to the future needs, of the people of the United States;

"(C) the promotion of adequate, economical, and efficient postal service at reasonable and equitable rates and fees;

"(D) the effect of postal services and the impact of postal rates and fees on users of the mails;

"(E) the requirements of the postal establishment with respect to the manner and form of preparation and presentation of mailings by the users of the various classes of mail service;

"(F) the value of mail;

"(G) the value of time of delivery of mail; and

"(H) the quality and character of the service rendered in terms of priority, secrecy, security, speed of transmission, use of facilities and manpower, and other pertinent service factors.

"(2) The acceptance, transportation, and delivery of first-class mail constitutes a preferred service of the postal establishment and, therefore, the postage for first-class mail should be sufficient to cover (A) the entire amount of the expenses allocated to first-class mail in accordance with this title and (B) an additional amount representing the fair value of all extraordinary and preferential services, facilities, and factors relating thereto.

"(3) Those services, elements of service, and facilities rendered and provided by the postal establishment in accordance with law, including services having public service aspects, which, in whole or in part, are held and considered by the Congress from time to time to be public services for the purposes of this title shall be administered on the following basis:

"(A) the sum of such public service items as determined by the Congress should be assumed directly by the Federal Government and paid directly out of the general fund of the Treasury and should not constitute direct charges in the form of rates and fees upon any user or class of users of such public services, or of the mails generally; and

"(B) nothing contained in any provision of this title should be construed as indicating any intention on the part of the Congress (i) that such public services, or any of them, should be limited or restricted or (ii) to derogate in any way from the need and desirability thereof in the public interest.

"(4) Postal rates and fees shall be adjusted from time to time as may be required to produce the amount of revenue approximately equal to the total cost of operating the postal establishment less the amount deemed to be attributable to the performance of public services under section 104 (b) of this title.

"Identification of and appropriations for public services

"SEC. 104. (a) The following shall be considered to be public services for the purposes of this title—

"(1) the total loss resulting from the transmission of matter in the mails free of postage or at reduced rates of postage as provided by statute, including the following:

"(A) paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 202 of the Act of February 28, 1925 (39 U. S. C. 283 (3)) relating to reduced rates of postage on newspapers or periodicals of certain nonprofit organizations;

"(B) sections 5 and 6 of the Act of March 3, 1877 (39 U. S. C. 321), relating to official mail matter of the Pan American Union sent free through the mails;

"(C) section 25 of the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (39 U. S. C. 286), and subsection (b) of section 2 of the Act of October 30, 1951 (39 U. S. C. 289a (b)), relating to free-in-county mailing privileges;

"(D) the Act of April 27, 1904 (33 Stat. 313), the last paragraph under the heading 'Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General' contained in the first section of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 551), and the Joint Resolution of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 668; Pub. Res., No. 33, Sixty-eighth Congress), as contained in the Act of October 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 737; Public Law 270, Seventy-seventh Congress), and as further amended by the Act of September 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 690), relating to free postage and reduced postage rates on reading matter and other articles for the blind (39 U. S. C. 331);

"(E) the Act of February 14, 1929 (39 U. S. C. 336), granting free mailing privileges to the diplomatic corps of the countries of the Pan American Postal Union;

"(F) the Act of April 15, 1937 (39 U. S. C. 293c), granting reduced rates to publications for use of the blind;

"(G) the Act of June 29, 1940 (39 U. S. C. 321–1), granting free mailing privileges to the Pan American Sanitary Bureau;

"(H) the Act of May 7, 1945 (59 Stat. 707), and other provisions of law granting free mailing privileges to individuals;

"(I) the second and third provisos of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 672; 39 U. S. C. 289a (a)), granting reduced second-class postage rates to publications of certain organizations;

"(J) the last proviso of section 3 of the Act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 673; 39 U. S. C. 290a–1), granting reduced third-class postage rates to certain organizations;

"(K) section 302 of The Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (5 U. S. C. 2192), granting free postage, including free airmail postage, to post cards, ballots, voting instructions, and envelopes transmitted in the mails under authority of such Act; and

"(L) section 204 (d) and (e) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, as amended (39 U. S. C. 292a (d) and (e)), including the amendment made by section 206 of this Act.

"(2) the loss resulting from the operation of such prime and necessary public services as the star route system and third- and fourth-class post offices;

"(3) the loss incurred in performing nonpostal services, such as the sale of documentary stamps for the Department of the Treasury;

"(4) the loss incurred in performing special services such as cash on delivery, insured mail, special delivery, and money orders; and

"(5) the additional cost of transporting United States mail by foreign air carriers at a Universal Postal Union rate in excess of the rate prescribed for United States carriers.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the revenues of the Post Office Department for each fiscal year from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated an amount, which shall be deemed to be attributable to the public services enumerated under subsection (a) of this section, equal to the total estimated expenditures of the Post Office Department for the year for such public services as determined by the Congress in the appropriation Act based upon budget estimates submitted to the Congress. Such appropriations shall be available to enable the Postmaster General to pay in to postal revenues at quarterly or other intervals such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Post Office Department for such amount attributable to public services.

"Reviews, studies, surveys, and reports of Postmaster General

"SEC. 105. (a) The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to initiate and conduct, through the facilities of the postal establishment, either on a continuing basis or from time to time, as he deems advisable, but not less often than every two years, a review of the postal-rate structure and a study and survey of the expenses incurred and the revenues received in connection with the several classes of

mail, and the various classes and kinds of services and facilities provided by the postal establishment, in order to determine, on the basis of such review, study, and survey for each class and kind of service or facility provided by the postal establishment, the need for adjustment of postal rates and fees in accordance with the policy set forth in this title.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall submit to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than April 15 of each alternate fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, a report of the results of the review, study, and survey conducted pursuant to subsection (a) of this section. Such report shall include—

"(1) information with respect to expenses and revenues which is pertinent to the allocation of expenses and the determination and adjustment of postal rates and fees in accordance with the policy set forth in this title; and

"(2) such other information as is necessary to enable the Congress, or as may be required by the Congress or an appropriate committee thereof, to carry out the purposes of this title.

"EFFECT ON FOURTH-CLASS MAIL RATES

"SEC. 106. The provisions of this title shall not require any downward adjustment in rates of postage on fourth-class mail existing on the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE II—POSTAL RATE INCREASES

"Short title

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Postal Rate Increase Act, 1958.'

"First-class mail

"SEC. 202. (a) That part of the first section of the Joint Resolution of June 30, 1947 (61 Stat. 213; 39 U. S. C. 280), which precedes the proviso, is amended by striking out '3 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '4 cents.'

"(b) Section 1 of the Act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 672; 39 U. S. C. 280), as amended, is further amended—

"(1) by striking out '2 cents' wherever appearing in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof '3 cents'; and

"(2) by striking out '2 cents' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof '3 cents.'

"Domestic airmail

"SEC. 203. Section 201 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1261; 39 U. S. C. 463a) is amended—

"(1) by striking out '6 cents' in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof '7 cents'; and

"(2) by striking out '4 cents' in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof '5 cents.'

"Second-class mail

"SEC. 204. (a) Section 2 (a) of the Act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 672; 39 U. S. C. 289a), is amended by striking out the word 'and' preceding clause (3) and by inserting immediately before the colon which precedes the first proviso a comma and the following: 'and (4) such postage is further adjusted to the amounts set forth in the following table, on the dates specified:

	January 1, 1959 (cents per pound or fraction thereof)	January 1, 1960 (cents per pound or fraction thereof)	January 1, 1961 (cents per pound or fraction thereof)
Nonadvertising portion	2.1	2.3	2.5
Advertising portion:			
First and second zones	2.2	2.6	3.0
Third zone	3.0	3.5	4.0
Fourth zone	4.5	5.2	6.0
Fifth zone	6.0	7.0	8.0
Sixth zone	7.7	8.7	10.0
Seventh zone	9.2	11.0	12.0
Eighth zone	11.0	12.5	14.0'

"(b) Section 2 (c) of such Act of October 30, 1951, is amended by striking out 'one-eighth of 1 cent' and inserting in lieu thereof 'one-fourth of 1 cent effective January 1, 1959, three-eighths of 1 cent effective January 1, 1960, and one-half of 1 cent effective January 1, 1961, except that (1) in no case shall the postage on each individually addressed copy mailed by the organizations listed, and for the purposes prescribed, in the second and third provisos of subsection (a) of this section be less than one-eighth of 1 cent and (2) the per copy rates prescribed for publications covered by section 25 of the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (39 U. S. C. 286), shall be continued.'

"(c) Section 2 (d) of such Act of October 30, 1951, is amended by striking out the words 'two ounces' where they appear the second time and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'ounce.'

"(d) The third clause of section 14 of the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (39 U. S. C. 226), is amended to read as follows:

"'Third. It must be formed of printed sheets: *Provided,* That publications produced by the stencil, mimeograph, or hectograph process or in imitation of typewriting shall not be regarded as printed within the meaning of this clause.'

"(e) Section 202 (a) of the Act of February 28, 1925, as amended (39 U. S. C. 283), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(4) For the purpose of this section, the portion of a publication devoted to advertisements shall include all advertisements inserted in such publication and attached permanently thereto.'

"Controlled circulation publications

"(f) Section 203 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1262; 39 U. S. C. 291b), is amended—

"(1) by striking out '10 cents a pound or fraction thereof' and inserting in lieu thereof '12 cents a pound or fraction thereof regardless of the weight of the individual copies'; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence reading 'The rates provided in this section shall remain in effect until otherwise provided by the Congress.'

"Third-class mail

"SEC. 205. Section 3 of the Act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 673; 39 U. S. C. 290a–1), is amended—

"(1) by striking out so much of such section as precedes the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The rate of postage on third-class matter shall be 3 cents for the first two ounces or fraction thereof, and 1½ cents for each additional ounce or fraction thereof up to but not including sixteen ounces in weight:';

"(2) in the first proviso contained in such section, by striking out '$10' and inserting in lieu thereof '$20';

"(3) in the second proviso contained in such section—

"(A) by striking out '14 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '16 cents'; and

"(B) by striking out '1 cent' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof '2 cents when mailed prior to July 1, 1960, and 2½ cents when mailed on or after such date';

"(4) by striking out the third proviso contained in such section;

"(5) in the fourth proviso contained in such section, by striking out '3 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '6 cents'; and

"(6) by striking out the last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '*And provided further,* That on and after January 1, 1959, the rates of postage on third-class matter mailed by religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, shall be the rates prescribed by this section, except that the minimum charge per piece for third-class matter mailed in bulk by such organizations or associations shall be 50 per centum of the minimum charge prescribed by this section for such mailings.'

"Fourth-class mail

"SEC. 206. (a) Section 204 (a) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 (39 U. S. C. 292a (a)), as amended, is amended by striking out the words 'over eight ounces' wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof 'sixteen ounces or over.'

"(b) Sections 204 (d) and (e) of such Act (39 U. S. C. 292a (d) and (e)) are amended to read as follows:

"'(d) The following materials when in parcels not exceeding seventy pounds in weight may be sent at the postage rate of 9 cents for the first pound and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof, and this rate shall continue until otherwise provided by the Congress: (1) books permanently bound for preservation consisting wholly of reading matter or scholarly bibliography or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for students' notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books; (2) sixteen-millimeter films and sixteen-millimeter film catalogs except when sent to commercial theaters; (3) printed music whether in bound form or in sheet form; (4) printed objective test materials and accessories thereto used by or in behalf of educational institutions in the testing of ability, aptitude, achievement, interests, and other mental and personal qualities with or without answers, test scores, or identifying information recorded thereon in writing or by mark; (5) phonograph recordings; and (6) manuscripts for books, periodical articles, and music.

"'(e) (1) The following materials when in parcels not exceeding seventy pounds in weight when loaned or exchanged between (A) schools, colleges, or universities and (B) public libraries, religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, or between such organizations and their members or readers or borrowers, shall be charged with postage at the rate of 4 cents for the first pound and 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof, except that the rates now or hereafter prescribed for third- or fourth-class matter shall apply in every case where such rate is lower than the rate prescribed in this subsection, and this rate shall continue until otherwise provided by the Congress: (i) books consisting wholly of reading matter or scholarly bibliography or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for students' notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books; (ii) printed music, whether in bound form or in sheet form; (iii) bound volumes of academic theses in typewritten or other duplicated form and bound volumes of periodicals; (iv) phonograph recordings; and (v) other library materials in printed, duplicated, or photographic form or in the form of unpublished manuscripts.

"'(2) The rate provided in paragraph (1) for books may apply to sixteen-millimeter films, filmstrips, transparencies for projection and slides, microfilms, sound recordings, and catalogs of such materials when sent in parcels not exceeding seventy pounds in weight to or from (A) schools, colleges, or universities and (B) public libraries, re-

ligious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual.

"'(3) Public libraries, organizations, or associations, before being entitled to the rates specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, shall furnish to the Postmaster General, under such regulations as he may prescribe, satisfactory evidence that none of their net income inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual.'

"(c) (1) The first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to readjust the size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail,' approved October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 610; 39 U. S. C. 240a), is amended by striking out the words 'over eight ounces' each place they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'sixteen ounces or over'.

"(2) Section 207 (a) of the Act of February 28, 1925 (39 U. S. C. 240), as amended, is amended by striking out the words 'in excess of eight ounces' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'sixteen ounces or over'.

"Books for the blind

"SEC. 207. The Act entitled 'An Act to further amend the Acts for promoting the circulation of reading matter among the blind', approved October 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 737), is amended by inserting immediately after 'for which no subscription fee is charged' a semicolon and the following: 'books, or pages thereof, in raised characters, whether prepared by hand or printed, which contain no advertisements, when furnished by any person to a blind person without cost to such blind person'.

"Subscription order, bill, and receipt forms

"SEC. 208. The final clause in the first sentence of the Act of January 20, 1888 (25 Stat. 1; 39 U. S. C. 249), is amended by striking out the following: ", but the same shall be in such form as to convey no other information than the name, place of publication, subscription price of the publication to which they refer and the subscription due thereon".

"Studies and reports with respect to third-class bulk-rate increases

"SEC. 209. (a) The Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration each is authorized and directed to initiate and conduct, through the facilities and personnel of his department or agency, as soon as practicable after July 1, 1959, a separate study of the increases in the rates of postage in third-class bulk-mail matter under the amendments made by section 205 (3) (A) and (B) of this title, in order to determine the effect of such increases on small business enterprises and on the users of the mails and the national economy generally.

"(b) The Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration each shall submit to the Senate and House of Representatives on or before March 1, 1960, a separate report of the results of the study conducted by him under subsection (a) of this section, together with such recommendations as may be necessary and appropriate.

"Investigation and study by Postmaster General of dimensional categories for first- and third-class mail envelopes

"SEC. 210. (a) The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of—

"(1) the establishment, by regulation of the Postmaster General, of such number of categories (but not less than two categories) of specified length and width dimensions for envelopes to be used for the transmission of first-class and third-class mail, as the Postmaster General may determine to be necessary or desirable to increase the efficient handling of the mail; and

"(2) the establishment of an additional charge on any such mail transmitted in an envelope which does not conform in length and width to one of such dimensional categories for envelopes.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall submit to the Senate and House of Representatives, on or before February 1, 1959, a report of the results of such investigation and study, together with his recommendations with respect thereto, including his recommendations for any necessary legislation.

"Determination of class of post office and compensation of postmaster and certain employees

"SEC. 211. No part of the gross postal receipts of any post office, which are determined in accordance with estimates of the Postmaster General to be attributable to the increases in postage rates provided by this Act, shall be counted for the purpose of determining the classes of the respective post offices and the compensation and allowances of postmasters and other employees whose compensation or allowances are based on the annual gross receipts of such post offices. Nothing contained in this section shall operate to relegate a post office to a class or receipts category below the class or receipts category to which such post office may be assigned on the basis of gross postal receipts accruing during the last complete calendar year prior to the date of enactment of this Act or, in the case of a post office which was in existence on such date of enactment but which was not in existence during the whole of such calendar year, on the basis of gross postal receipts accruing during the last quarter prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

"Salary step increases

"SEC. 212. (a) Subsection (a) of section 401 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended (39 U. S. C. 981 (a)), is amended by striking out 'salary level PFS–9 or a lower salary level of.'

"(b) Subsection (b) of such section (39 U. S. C. 981 (b)) is repealed.

"Conditions precedent to withdrawal from general fund of Treasury

"SEC. 213. That part of the paragraph under the heading 'General Provisions' under the appropriations for the Post Office Department contained in chapter IV of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (64 Stat. 1050; 31 U. S. C. 695), which precedes the provisio is amended by striking out 'the receipt of revenue from fourth-class mail service sufficient to pay the cost of such service' and inserting in lieu thereof '(1) that the revenues from fourth-class mail service will not exceed by more than 4 per centum the costs thereof and (2) that the costs of such fourth-class mail service will not exceed by more than 4 per centum the revenues therefrom.'

"Repeals

"SEC. 214. (a) The following provisions of law are hereby repealed—

"(1) The Act of June 9, 1930 (39 U. S. C. 793), relating to certification of estimated amounts of postage that would have been collected on certain free or reduced-rate mailings, which the Postmaster General is required to make to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Comptroller General of the United States;

"(2) Paragraph (4) of section 202 (a) of the Act of February 28, 1925 (45 Stat. 941; 39 U. S. C. 283 (4));

"(3) Section 202 (b) of the Act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1066; 39 U. S. C. 283 (b)); and

"(4) Section 204 of the Act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1067; 39 U. S. C. 288).

"(b) The last sentence of section 4 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act as contained in the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956 (70 Stat. 747) is hereby repealed, and hereafter the amounts contributed by the Post Office Department to the civil service retirement and disability fund in compliance with such section 4 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be considered as costs of providing postal service for the purpose of establishing postal rates.

"Effective dates

"SEC. 215. (a) The provisions of this section and sections 201, 204 (d), 204 (e), 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, and 214 (a) (1), (2), and (4) of this title shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

"(b) The provisions of sections 202, 203, 204 (c), 204 (f), 205 (1), 205 (5), and 206 of this title shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins at least 40 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(c) The porvisions of section 204 (a) and (b) of this title shall become effective as provided in such section 204 (a) and (b).

"(d) The provisions of sections 205 (2), 205 (3), 205 (4), 205 (6), and 214 (a) (3) of this title shall become effective on January 1, 1959.

"(e) The provisions of sections 207 and 208 of this title shall become effective on July 1, 1958.

"(f) The provisions of section 214 (b) of this title shall become effective as of the effective date of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956.

"TITLE III—POSTAL MODERNIZATION FUND

"Establishment of fund

"SEC 301. There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the 'Postal Modernization Fund' (hereinafter referred to as the 'Fund').

"Appropriations to fund

"SEC. 302. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated and paid into the Fund such sums as may be necessary during each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959 and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, to carry out the purposes of this title.

"Expenditure from fund

"SEC. 303. Moneys paid into the Fund, together with any income thereof under section 304 (b) or otherwise, shall be available until expended for obligation by the Postmaster General for the purpose of conducting research, either directly or through private or other organizations, and for the purpose of developing, acquiring, and placing into operation improved equipment and facilities for the performance of the postal function.

"Management of fund

"SEC. 304. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to hold the Fund, and (after consultation with the Postmaster General) to report to the Congress not later than the first day of January of each year (beginning with 1960) on the financial condition of the Fund as of the end of the next preceding fiscal year.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such portion of the Fund as is not, in his judgment, after consultation with the Postmaster General, required to meet current withdrawals. Such investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

"Report of Postmaster General

"SEC. 305. The Postmaster General shall include in his annual report to the President for each year a detailed report of his activities during such year under this title.

"TITLE IV—INCREASES IN COMPENSATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 401. The Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, approved June 10, 1955 (Public Law 68, Eighty-fourth Congress), is hereby amended as follows:

"(a) In section 301 (a) strike out the Postal Field Service Schedule, and insert the following schedule:

"'*Postal Field Service Schedule*

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
1	$3,095	$3,205	$3,315	$3,425	$3,535	$3,645	$3,755
Temporary rate	3,170	3,285	3,400	3,515	3,630	3,745	3,860
2	3,320	3,435	3,550	3,665	3,780	3,895	4,010
Temporary rate	3,405	3,525	3,645	3,765	3,885	4,005	4,125
3	3,580	3,705	3,830	3,955	4,080	4,205	4,330
Temporary rate	3,670	3,800	3,930	4,060	4,190	4,320	4,450
4	3,935	4,070	4,205	4,340	4,475	4,610	4,745
Temporary rate	4,035	4,175	4,315	4,455	4,595	4,735	4,875
5	4,170	4,305	4,440	4,575	4,710	4,845	4,980
Temporary rate	4,275	4,415	4,555	4,695	4,835	4,975	5,115
6	4,505	4,655	4,805	4,955	5,105	5,255	5,405
Temporary rate	4,620	4,775	4,930	5,085	5,240	5,395	5,550
7	4,870	5,035	5,200	5,365	5,530	5,695	5,860
Temporary rate	4,945	5,110	5,275	5,440	5,605	5,770	5,935
8	5,255	5,440	5,625	5,810	5,995	6,180	6,365
9	5,675	5,875	6,075	6,275	6,475	6,675	6,875
10	6,235	6,450	6,665	6,880	7,095	7,310	7,525
11	6,860	7,095	7,330	7,565	7,800	8,035	8,270
12	7,545	7,805	8,065	8,325	8,585	8,845	9,105
13	8,310	8,590	8,870	9,150	9,430	9,710	9,990
14	9,140	9,440	9,740	10,040	10,340	10,640	10,940
15	10,050	10,350	10,650	10,950	11,250	11,550	11,850
16	11,075	11,375	11,675	11,975	12,275	12,575	12,875
17	12,255	12,555	12,855	13,155	13,455	13,755	14,055
18	13,760	14,060	14,360	14,660	14,960	15,260	15,560
19	15,000	15,300	15,600	15,900			
20	16,000'						

"(b) In section 302 (a) strike out the Rural Carrier Schedule, and insert the following schedule:

"'*Rural Carrier Schedule*

	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:							
Fixed compensation per annum	$1,841	$1,896	$1,951	$2,006	$2,061	$2,116	$2,171
Temporary rate	1,941	2,001	2,061	2,121	2,181	2,241	2,301
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	65	67	69	71	73	75	77
For each mile of route over 30 miles	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:							
Fixed compensation per annum	1,841	------	------	------	------	------	------
Temporary rate	1,941	------	------	------	------	------	------
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	65	------	------	------	------	------	------
For each mile of route over 30 miles	22	------	------	------	------	------	------
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)'

[1] Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier.

"(c) In section 302 (c) strike out '$4,700' and insert '$5,165 during the period referred to in section 304 (c) or $5,035 thereafter.'

"(d) In section 303 (a) strike out the Fourth-Class Office Schedule and insert the following schedule:

"'*Fourth-Class Office Schedule*

Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
$1,300 to $1,499.99	$2,703	$2,793	$2,883	$2,973	$3,063	$3,153	$3,243
Temporary rate	2,771	2,863	2,955	3,047	3,139	3,231	3,323
$900 to $1,299.99	2,477	2,559	2,641	2,723	2,805	2,887	2,969
Temporary rate	2,539	2,623	2,707	2,791	2,875	2,959	3,043
$600 to $899.99	2,027	2,094	2,161	2,228	2,295	2,362	2,429
Temporary rate	2,078	2,148	2,218	2,288	2,358	2,428	2,498
$350 to $599.99	1,577	1,629	1,681	1,733	1,785	1,837	1,889
Temporary rate	1,616	1,669	1,722	1,775	1,828	1,881	1,934
$250 to $349.99	1,127	1,164	1,201	1,238	1,275	1,312	1,349
Temporary rate	1,155	1,193	1,231	1,269	1,307	1,345	1,383
$200 to $249.99	901	931	961	991	1,021	1,051	1,081
Temporary rate	924	954	984	1,014	1,044	1,074	1,104
$100 to $199.99	676	698	720	742	764	786	808
Temporary rate	693	715	737	759	781	803	825
Under $100	450	465	480	495	510	525	540
Temporary rate	461	476	491	506	521	536	551'

"(a) In section 304 insert the following new subsection:

"'(c) Wherever a temporary per annum rate is provided by a basic salary schedule contained in this title, such temporary rate shall be in effect, in lieu of the regular scheduled rate, for the period beginning on the effective date of this amendment and ending on the last day of the last pay period which begins not more than three years after such date.'

"SEC. 402 (a) The annual rate of basic salary of any officer or employee whose basic salary by reason of the provisions of section 504 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 is at a rate between two scheduled rates, or above the highest scheduled rate, in the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, whichever may be applicable, is hereby increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this title in the next lower rate of the appropriate level in such schedule.

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'basic salary' has the same meaning as when used in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955.

"SEC. 403. No increase under the provisions of this title shall be construed to be an equivalent increase within the meaning of section 401 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955.

"SEC. 404. The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized and directed to grant, effective as of January 1, 1958, increases in the compensation of postal employees of the Canal Zone Government comparable to those provided by this title for similar employees.

"SEC. 405. This Act shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

"SEC. 406. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal goverment of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this title, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to a postmaster, officer, or employee who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1958, and ending on the date of enactment of this title for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress), as amended, for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1958, and ending on the date of enactment of this title by a postmaster, officer, or employee who died during such period. Such retroactive compensation or salary shall not be considered as basic salary for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act in the case of any such retired or deceased postmaster officer, or employee.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 407. (a) This title shall take effect as of the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1958.

"(b) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this title shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of such enactment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
MIKE MONRONEY,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5836) entitled "An act to readjust postal rates and to establish a Congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes", submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendments struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text and provided a new title for the House bill.

With respect to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the House bill, the committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the text of the House bill and the text provided by the Senate amendment and that the Senate agree to the same.

A summary of the major provisions of the conference substitute follows.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF MAJOR CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

Increased revenue

Postal revenues will be increased by $550,000,000 per annum when all of the postal rate adjustments provided by the conference substitute become effective.

Cost of postal pay increase

The annual cost of the postal pay increases provided by the conference substitute will be $265,000,000. The cost of the retroactive effect of such pay increases will be approximately $97,000,000.

Postal rates

A table comparing present and proposed postal rates appears on page 20.

First-Class Mail

The letter rate is increased from 3 cents to 4 cents, and rates on post and postal cards and drop letters are increased from 2 cents to 3 cents, as in the House bill. The increases are effective August 1, 1958.

Domestic Airmail

The airmail letter rate is increased from 6 cents to 7 cents, and the airmail card rate from 4 cents to 5 cents, as in the House bill. The increases are effective August 1, 1958.

Second-Class Mail

Publishers' pound rates are identical to the publishers' pound rates provided by the Senate amendment, as shown in the following table:

	Step 1	Sept 2	Step 3
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*
Nonadvertising portion	2.1	2.3	2.5
Advertising portion:			
First and second zones	2.2	2.6	3.0
Third zone	3.0	3.5	4.0
Fourth zone	4.5	5.2	6.0
Fifth zone	6.0	7.0	8.0
Sixth zone	7.7	8.7	10.0
Seventh zone	9.2	11.0	12.0
Eighth zone	11.0	12.5	14.0
Minimum per piece	.25	.375	.5

The step increases are effective January 1 of the next 3 calendar years. Periodicals of nonprofit organizations are exempted from these increases, as in the House bill.

The "transient" rate is increased from 1 cent on each 2 ounces above the first 2 ounces to 1 cent for each ounce above the first 2 ounces, as in the Senate amendment, which is similar in effect to the House provision.

Second-class entry is authorized for publications with hard binding. Application of advertising rates to advertisements inserted in publications is reaffirmed. These provisions are contained in the Senate amendment.

Controlled Circulation Publications

A uniform, increased rate of 12 cents per pound is provided for these publications regardless of weight of individual issue, with the present minimum charge of 1 cent per piece continued, as in both House and Senate versions.

Third-Class Mail

Individual piece rates are increased (a) on circulars and merchandise from 2 to 3 cents on the first 2 ounces and from 1 cent to 1.5 cents on each additional ounce, and (b) on the first 2 ounces of books and catalogs from 2 cents to 3 cents, as in both House and Senate versions. The increase on additional ounces of books and catalogs over the first 2 ounces is from 1.5 cents on each additional 2 ounces to 1.5 cents on each additional ounce, as in the Senate amendment.

The bulk rates on circulars, merchandise, books, and catalogs are identical to the bulk rates provided by the Senate amendment, as shown in the following table:

	Step 1	Step 2
Circulars, merchandise, etc.—	*Cents*	*Cents*
Per pound	16	
Minimum per piece	2	2.5
Books and catalogs—		
Per pound	[1] 10	
Minimum per piece	2	2.5

[1] Present rate continued.

The rates for step 1 and step 2 as shown in the above table are effective January 1, 1959, and July 1, 1960, respectively.

The minimum per-piece rate on bulk mailings of nonprofit organizations will be increased from 1 cent to 1¼ cents, as in the Senate amendment, effective July 1, 1960.

Items of third-class mail may weigh up to, but not including, 16 ounces, as in the Senate amendment, compared to the present 8-ounce maximum.

The charge for odd sizes and shapes is increased from 3 cents to 6 cents, as in the Senate amendment.

The bulk mailing permit fee is increased from $10 to $20, as in both House and Senate versions.

Fourth-Class Mail

Book rates are increased from 8 cents on the first pound and 4 cents on each additional pound to 9 cents on the first pound and 5 cents on each additional pound. The House bill provided 10 cents on the first pound. The category of items subject to such rates is broadened, combining similar House and Senate provisions.

Existing library book rates are continued, extended to additional materials, and applied regardless of zone of delivery, combining similar House and Senate provisions.

The minimum weight for fourth-class mailings is increased from "over 8 ounces" to 16 ounces, as in the Senate bill.

Miscellaneous

(1) Free mailing of books for the blind is extended to individuals, (2) the inclusion of additional material in subscription notices in publications is authorized, (3) automatic step increases above step 4 are extended to employees in salary levels 10 and above, and (4) the Postmaster General is directed to study and report to the Congress on the desirability of standard envelope sizes for first- and third-class mailings, and of additional charges on envelopes not conforming to such dimensions, as in the Senate amendment.

Obsolete or unnecessary laws are repealed, including (1) a requirement for certification of certain postal costs to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller General, (2) a graduated scale of rates for publications based on the number of individually addressed copies per pound, (3) the exemption from advertising rates for publications having not over 5 percent advertising content (conforming to the new publishers' rates), and (4) a special rate for any one issue of a publication weighing not over 1 pound and mailed to a single zone, as in the Senate amendment.

Increased revenues from the postal rate increases are excluded in the determination of classes of post offices and compensation of postmasters and certain other employees, as in both House and Senate versions, based on certain estimates by the Postmaster General as provided in the Senate amendment.

Post Office Department contributions to the civil service retirement and disability fund are included in postal costs for the purpose of establishing postal rates, as in both House and Senate versions.

The requirement that the Postmaster General petition for fourth-class rate adjustments is revised to provide that such rates will assure that postal revenues and expenses for such mail will not vary by more than 4 percent. The House bill contained the same provision, but with a 1 percent variation.

The Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration are required to study, and to report to the Congress on, the impact of third-class bulk rate increases on small business, mail users, and the national economy.

Postal Policy

The conference substitute provides that the total loss on mail carried free or at reduced rates shall be considered as public service to be paid for from the general fund of the Treasury and not apportioned to other users of the mails. Appropriations to reimburse the postal service for such losses are authorized. The losses are the total losses on periodicals and on advertising mailed by nonprofit groups, Pan American Union mail (including mail of the diplomatic corps of the countries in the Union), free-in-county mail, books and other articles for the blind, Pan American Sanitary Bureau mail, mail sent under The Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955, free mail for certain individuals, books mailed under the special book and library book rates, nonpostal services for other departments, special postal services such as c. o. d., etc., the loss on operation of star routes and third- and fourth-class post offices, and the added cost of United States mail sent by foreign air carriers at a higher Universal Postal Union rate.

The Postmaster General is directed to review and study, at least every 2 years, the postal rate structure, revenues and expenses related to the several classes of mail, and types of services and facilities to determine the need for postal rate adjustments in accordance with the policy provisions in the conference substitute. The Postmaster General will report to the Congress each second year on the results.

Postal Modernization Fund

The conference substitute establishes a Postal Modernization Fund in the Treasury, authorizes appropriations thereto for the fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961, provides for use of the Fund for research and the development and placing into operation of improved equipment and facilities, and prescribes conditions for the management of the Fund and reports of operations thereunder, based on similar provisions in the Senate amendment.

Postal Pay

Postal employees are granted a permanent increase of 7½ percent plus a temporary increase for 3 years of 2½ percent in levels 1 through 6, and 1½ percent in level 7, of the PFS schedule, with comparable increases for rural carriers and fourth-class postmasters. Both increases are retroactive to the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1958.

TABLE OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED RATES

[In cents except as otherwise indicated]

Mail classification	Unit	Present	House bill				Senate amendment				Conference substitute			
			Steps				Steps				Steps			
			1st	2d	3d	4th	1st	2d	3d		1st	2d	3d	
First-class:														
Letters	Ounce	3.0	4.0				4.0 local; 5.0 nonlocal for 3 years				4.0			
Cards	Each	2.0	3.0				[1] 3.0				3.0			
Drop letters	Ounce	2.0	3.0				3.0				3.0			
Airmail:														
Letters	do	6.0	7.0				8.0				7.0			
Cards	Each	4.0	5.0				5.0				5.0			
Second-class:														
Publishers outside county:														
Editorial	Pound	1.95	2.2	2.5	2.8	3.1	2.1	2.3	2.5		2.1	2.3	2.5	
Advertising:														
Zones 1 and 2	do	1.95	2.2	2.5	2.8	3.1	2.2	2.6	3.0		2.2	2.6	3.0	
Zone 3	do	2.6	3.0	3.4	3.8	4.2	3.0	3.5	4.0		3.0	3.5	4.0	
Zone 4	do	3.9	4.5	5.1	5.7	6.2	4.5	5.2	6.0		4.5	5.2	6.0	
Zone 5	do	5.2	6.0	6.8	7.5	8.3	6.0	7.0	8.0		6.0	7.0	8.0	
Zone 6	do	6.5	7.5	8.4	9.4	10.4	7.7	8.7	10.0		7.7	8.7	10.0	
Zone 7	do	7.8	9.0	10.1	11.3	12.5	9.2	11.0	12.0		9.2	11.0	12.0	
Zone 8	do	9.1	10.5	11.8	13.2	14.6	11.0	12.5	14.0		11.0	12.5	14.0	
Minimum per copy	Each	⅛	¼				¼	⅜	½		¼	⅜	½	
Nonprofit organizations	All units	All rates	Exempt				50 percent of regular rates				Exempt			
Transient	1st 2 oz	2.0	2.0				2.0				2.0			
	Added 2 oz	1.0	1.5											
	Added oz						1.0				1.0			
Third-class:														
Individual piece:														
Circulars, merchandise, and miscellaneous.	1st 2 oz	2.0	3.0				3.0				3.0			
	Added oz	1.0	1.5				1.5				1.5			
Books and catalogs	1st 2 oz	2.0	3.0				3.0				3.0			
	Added 2 oz	1.5												
	Added oz		1.0				1.5				1.5			
Bulk mailings:														
Circulars, merchandise, and miscellaneous.	Pound	14.0	16.0				16.0				16.0			
	Piece min	1.5	2.5				[2] 2.0–2.5				[2] 2.0–2.5			
Books and catalogs	Pound	10.0	12.0				10.0				10.0			
	Piece min	1.5	2.5				[2] 2.0–2.5				[2] 2.0–2.5			
Odd sizes	do	3.0	5.0				6.0				6.0			
Permit fee	Year	$10	$20				$20				$20			
Nonprofit organizations [4]	Piece min	1.0	1.0				[3] 1.25				[3] 1.25			
Fourth-class: Books (other than library).	1st pound	8.0	10.0				8.0				9.0			
	Added pound	4.0	5.0				4.0				5.0			
Controlled circulation	Not over 8 oz	10.0	12.0				12.0				12.0			
	Over 8 oz	11.0	12.0				12.0				12.0			

[1] Cards wholly in original handwriting exempted and continued at present rate.
[2] Increased in 2 steps.
[3] Increased rate applies when second step-increase in regular per piece minimum rates become effective.
[4] See page 31, for explanation of provisions of Senate amendment relating to such organizations.

A detailed explanation of the provisions of the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference substitute is set forth below:

"EXPLANATION OF HOUSE BILL, SENATE AMENDMENT, AND CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

"The text of the House bill consisted of two titles preceded by a short General Statement covering the scope and purpose of the House bill.

"Title I provided for present increases in postal rates.

"Title II contained a new postal policy, as conceived by the House, which would serve as a guide in the determination and adjustment of postal rates by the Congress from time to time in the future.

"The Senate amendment to the House text consisted of four titles.

"Title I set forth a postal policy, as conceived by the Senate, which would provide a basis for the determination and adjustment of the postal-rate structure from time to time by action of the Congress.

"Title II provided for present increases in postal rates.

"Title III established a Postal Modernization Fund to be available for the conduct of research and for the development, acquisition, and utilization of improved equipment and facilities for the performance of the postal function.

"Title IV provided for increases in the rates of basic salary of postal field service employees.

"The House bill contained no provisions comparable to title III or title IV of the Senate amendment.

"Except for technical and minor drafting changes, the differences between the texts of the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference substitute are explained below.

"Preliminary general statement

"House bill: The House bill contained a General Statement immediately following the enacting clause which outlined the scope and purpose of the House bill.

"This statement was to the effect that the Congress recognizes the necessity and desirability of adjustments in present postal rates and fees so that, insofar as consistent with the public interest and the postal rate policy set forth in title II of the House bill, postal revenues will more nearly equal postal expenses and postal service will be improved.

"This statement also contained a provision to the effect that the Congress recognizes that it is necessary and desirable in the public interest that the Congress establish a firm policy with respect to postal activities, revenues, and expenses which will serve as a guide in the determination and adjustment by the Congress, from time to time, of the postal-rate structure.

"Senate amendment: The Senate amendment did not commence with a general statement, although ideas of the same general import may be found in the postal policy declaration contained in title I of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: The conference substitute omits the General Statement contained in the House bill.

"Postal rate increases

"Title I of the House bill and title II of the Senate amendment provided for increases in postal rates.

"The postal rate increase provisions of the conference substitute are contained in title II of the conference substitute.

"1. Short Title

"House bill: Section 101 of the House bill provided for title I of the House bill the short title 'Postal Rate Increase Act, 1957'.

"Senate amendment: Section 201 of the Senate amendment provided for title II of the Senate amendment the short title 'Postal Rate Increase Act, 1958'.

"Conference substitute: The conference substitute adopts the Senate short title 'Postal Rate Increase Act, 1958'.

"2. First-Class Mail

"First-class mail includes all matter wholly or partly in writing (whether sealed or unsealed), except manuscript copy accompanying proofsheets or corrected proofsheets of the same and the writing authorized by law to be placed upon matter of other classes. First-class mail also includes matter sealed or otherwise closed against inspection.

"House bill: Letters. Section 102 (a) of the House bill proposed increases in the rate on all first-class letter mail from 3 cents to 4 cents an ounce or fraction thereof.

"Post and postal cards and drop letters. Section 102 (b) of the House bill proposed increases in the rates on post cards, each portion of double post cards, and private mailing cards from 2 cents to 3 cents. The rate on 'drop letters' (letters mailed for local delivery at post offices where free delivery by carrier is not established and where these letters are not collected or delivered by rural or star route carrier) also would be increased from 2 cents to 3 cents an ounce or fraction thereof.

"Senate amendment: Letters. Section 202 (a) of the Senate amendment proposed an increase in the rate on first-class letter mail mailed for nonlocal delivery from 3 cents to 5 cents an ounce or fraction thereof and an increase in the rate on first-class letter mail mailed for local delivery from 3 cents to 4 cents an ounce or fraction thereof.

"The proposed 5-cent nonlocal delivery rate would expire on July 1, 1961, at which time the first-class letter rate would be uniform at 4 cents an ounce or fraction thereof.

"Mail 'for local delivery' would include mail originating within the delivery limits of a post office for delivery to an addressee located within the delivery limits of such post office. In addition, in large cities with densely-populated adjacent areas having two or more post offices, the Postmaster General would be authorized (in his discretion) to apply the concept of mail 'for local delivery' for rate purposes to first-class matter mailed at one of such post offices and addressed for delivery at another of such offices.

"Post and postal cards and drop letters. Section 202 (b) of the Senate amendment proposed increases (similar to those in the House bill) in the rates on post cards, each portion of double post cards, private mailing cards, and drop letters, from 2 cents to 3 cents.

"These proposed increases in the rates on post and postal cards would be qualified by section 202 (c) of the Senate amendment which provided that the rate on certain single postal cards and private mailing or post cards shall be 2 cents if the address and message thereon are wholly in original handwriting. The term 'handwriting' does not include typewritten matter, matter which is a reproduction or imitation of handwriting prepared by mechanical, photographic, or other process, and any matter (whether or

not handwritten) which is attached to the card. Section 202 (c) also provided that the Postmaster General may provide by regulation for the preparation and sale of postal cards of a distinctive color for transmission in the mails at the special 2-cent rate for cards in original handwriting.

"Conference substitute: Letters. Section 202 (a) of the conference substitute, like section 102 (a) of the House bill, increased the rate on all first-class letter mail from 3 cents to 4 cents an ounce or fraction thereof.

"Post and postal cards and drop letters. Section 202 (b) of the conference substitute, like section 102 (b) of the House bill, increased the rates on post cards, each portion of double post cards, and private mailing cards from 2 cents to 3 cents.

"The rate on drop letters also is increased from 2 cents to 3 cents an ounce or fraction thereof as provided by the House bill.

"Effective date. The effective date of rate increases on first-class letter mail, post and postal cards, and drop letters provided by the conference substitute is the first day of the first month which begins at least 40 days after the date of enactment of the conference substitute in lieu of October 1, 1957, as provided by the House bill and July 1, 1958, as provided by the Senate amendment.

"3. Domestic Airmail

"Domestic airmail includes letters and other matter weighing 8 ounces or less which is given preferential handling, including transportation by air.

"House bill: Letters, post and postal cards, and other matter. Section 103 of the House bill proposed an increase in the rate on airmail letters and other matter from 6 cents to 7 cents an ounce or fraction thereof. Section 103 also proposed an increase from 4 cents to 5 cents each in the rate on airmail postal cards and private mailing or post cards.

"Senate amendment: Letters, post and postal cards, and other matter. Section 202 (c) of the Senate amendment proposed an increase in the rate on airmail letters and other matter from 6 cents to 8 cents an ounce or fraction thereof (in lieu of the 7-cent rate proposed by the House bill). The proposed increase in the rate on airmail post and postal cards was from 4 cents to 5 cents each—the same as the House bill.

"Conference substitute: Letters, post and postal cards, and other matter. Section 203 of the conference substitute, like section 103 of the House bill, increases the rate on airmail letters and other matter from 6 cents to 7 cents an ounce or fraction thereof. Also, the rate on airmail postal cards and private mailing or post cards is increased from 4 cents to 5 cents each, as provided by section 103 of the House bill.

"The effective date of these rate increases on domestic airmail provided by the conference substitute is the first day of the first month which begins at least 40 days after the date of enactment of the conference substitute in lieu of October 1, 1957, as provided in the House bill, and July 1, 1958, as provided in the Senate amendment.

"4. Second-Class Mail

"Second-class mail consists of publishers' second-class mail (periodical publications, newspapers, and magazines, mailed by publishers and news agents) and transient second-class mail (publications entered as second-class matter when sent by others than the publishers or news agents).

"House bill: Publishers' second-class mail. Section 104 (a) of the House bill proposed an increase in the pound rates on the advertising and nonadvertising portions of publications mailed by publishers or news agents, addressed for delivery outside the county of publication, by four annual increments of approximately 15 percent each. Such section 104 (a) retained those provisions of existing law under which the nonadvertising rate applies with respect to the entire publication if not more than 5 percent of the space of the publication is devoted to advertising. This increase proposed by section 104 (a) would not apply to newspaper issues having press runs of 5,000 copies or less and the applicable existing rates would continue to be in effect with respect to such issues until otherwise provided by Congress. Also, this increase would not apply to publications of nonprofit religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations or to publications of a religious, educational, or scientific nature designed specifically for use in classrooms or in religious instruction classes.

"Minimum charge per piece on individually addressed copies of second-class mail publications mailed by publishers and news agents. Section 104 (b) of the House bill proposed an increase from one-eighth cent per piece to one-fourth cent per piece in the minimum charge per piece on each individually addressed copy of a second-class mail publication mailed by a publisher or news agent. This increase in the minimum charge per piece would not apply to copies of publications mailed for delivery within the county of mailing. Also, this minimum charge per piece increase would not apply to copies of publications mailed by the above-listed types of nonprofit organizations and associations or of the above-mentioned publications for classroom use.

"Transient second-class mail. Section 104 (c) of the House bill proposed a rate increase, for publications having second-class entry mailed by others than the publishers or authorized news agents or mailed as sample copies in excess of the 10 percent allowance at the publishers' rate, from the present rate of 2 cents for the first 2 ounces and 1 cent for each additional 2 ounces or fraction thereof to 2 cents for the first 2 ounces and 1½ cents for each additional 2 ounces or fraction thereof.

"Special 'break-even' publishers' and news agents' rates. Section 104 (d) of the House bill proposed the establishment of special 'break-even' rates for the mailings of individual publishers and news agents in those cases occurring in any fiscal year (beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958) in which the costs incurred by the Post Office Department exceeded by $100,000 the revenues received by the Department in connection with the mailings of the individual publisher or news agent concerned. These special rates would be fixed and determined by the Postmaster General, for the remainder of the fiscal year concerned, on a basis which would effect, as nearly as practicable, the equalization of revenues and costs for the mailings of the individual publisher or news agent concerned. At the beginning of the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which the Postmaster General established these special rates for the mailings of any individual publisher or news agent, the regular rates again would apply to such mailings, subject, however, to a possible subsequent imposition of special rates for the remainder of the fiscal year if the $100,000 loss limit again were exceeded.

"These special 'break-even' rate provisions were made expressly inapplicable to any newspaper or periodical maintained by and in the interests of any nonprofit religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organization or association, to any religious, educational, or scientific publication designed specifically for use in school classrooms or in religious instruction classes, and to any such nonprofit organization or association itself.

"No provisions for special 'break-even' publishers' and news agents' rates were contained in the Senate amendment.

"Senate amendment: Publishers' second-class mail. Section 203 (a) of the Senate amendment proposed an increase in the pound rates on the nonadvertising portions of publications mailed by publishers or news agents, addressed for delivery outside the county of publication, by three annual increments of approximately 10 percent each, effective, respectively, on July 1, 1958, July 1, 1959, and July 1, 1960. Section 203 (a) also proposed an increase in the pound rates on the advertising portions of such publications by three annual increments of approximately 20 percent each, also effective, respectively, on such dates.

"Under existing law and under section 104 (a) of the House bill, the nonadvertising rate applies with respect to the entire publication if not more than 5 percent of the space of the publication is devoted to advertising. Under the proposal contained in section 203 (a) of the Senate amendment, this existing 5 percent provision is eliminated and the advertising rate would apply to the advertising portion even though the advertising portion is less than 5 percent.

"Publications of nonprofit organizations or associations and publications designed for classroom use. Section 203 (b) of the Senate amendment proposed an adjustment in the rates of postage on newspapers and periodicals maintained by and in the interests of nonprofit religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations, as follows: on and after July 1, 1958, the regular pound rate or minimum rate, as applicable, reduced by 50 percent. Section 203 (b) also proposed an adjustment in the rates of postage on religious, educational, or scientific publications designed specifically for use in school classrooms or in religious instruction classes, as follows: on and after July 1, 1958, the regular pound rate or minimum rate, as applicable, reduced by 35 percent. The House bill contained no provisions comparable to the foregoing two provisions but retained existing rates on publications of such nonprofit organizations and associations and on publications designed for classroom use.

"Minimum charge per piece on individually addressed copies of second-class mail publications mailed by publishers and news agents. Section 203 (c) of the Senate amendment proposed an increase in the existing rate of one-eighth cent per piece in the minimum charge per piece on each individually addressed copy of a second-class mail publication mailed by a publisher or news agent, as follows: to one-fourth of one cent, effective July 1, 1958; to three-eighths of one cent, effective July 1, 1959; and to one-half of one cent, effective July 1, 1960. In accordance with the provisions contained in section 203 (b), the increased minimum charge per piece applicable to publications of nonprofit organizations and associations would be reduced by 50 percent and the minimum charge per piece applicable to publications designed for classroom use would be reduced by 35 percent. However, publication copies entitled to the free-in-county mailing privilege would be exempted from the increases provided by section 203 (c).

"Transient Second-Class Mail. Section 203 (d) of the Senate amendment proposed a rate increase, effective on July 1, 1958, for publications having second-class entry mailed by others than the publishers or authorized news agents or mailed as sample copies in excess of the 10 percent allowance at the publishers' rate, from the present rate of 2 cents for the first 2 ounces and 1 cent for each additional 2 ounces or fraction thereof to 2 cents for the first 2 ounces and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof.

"Admission to Second-Class Mail Category of Publications With Board, Cloth, Leather,

and Other Substantial Bindings. Section 14 of the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (39 U. S. C. 226), contains conditions governing the admission of publications to the second-class mail privilege. The third of these conditions now requires that the publication '* * * must be formed of printed paper sheets, without board, cloth, leather, or other substantial binding, such as distinguish printed books for preservation from periodical publications * * *.' This existing provision has the effect of denying the second-class mail privilege to publications having substantial bindings.

"Section 203 (e) of the Senate amendment proposed to change this provision, effective on the date of enactment, in order to make the second-class mailing privilege available to publications having board, cloth, leather, or other substantial bindings.

"The House bill contained no provision comparable to that contained in such section 203 (e).

"Application of second-class mail rates to advertising portions of publications entered as second-class matter: Section 203 (f) of the Senate amendment contained an amendment to section 202 (a) of the Act of February 28, 1925 (39 U. S. C. 283). This amendment reaffirms, in effect, that provision of law which requires the payment of second-class mail advertising rates on advertisements which are inserted in and attached permanently to a publication.

"The amendment proposed by section 203 (f) of the Senate amendment is consistent with the amendment proposed by section 203 (e) of the Senate amendment, which proposed to remove from existing law the requirement that a publication '* * * must be formed of printed paper sheets * * *' in order to gain admission to the second-class mail privilege.

"In conformity with existing law, the Post Office Department has held consistently that there could not be included in publications admitted to the second-class mail privilege those advertisements which, in effect, did not consist of printed paper sheets—that is, advertisements printed upon and consisting of foil laminates and similar materials, which (although in sheet form) are not 'printed paper sheets' and, in many instances, constitute actual samples of the product advertised.

"There is an increasing use of foil laminates and other material not constituting 'printed paper sheets' for advertisement purposes. The proposed elimination from the law by sections 203 (e) and 203 (f) of the Senate amendment of the requirement that the second-class mail publication sheets be of paper will permit the Post Office Department to revise its rulings in this area in keeping with existing circumstances and conditions and modern practices.

"The House bill contained no provision comparable to section 203 (f) of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Publishers' second-class mail. Section 204 (a) of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of section 203 (a) of the Senate amendment, which provided three annual increases in the pound rates on publishers' second-class mail, except that the conference substitute provides that the three annual increases in such pound rates will become effective on January 1, 1959, January 1, 1960, and January 1, 1961, respectively, instead of July 1, 1958, July 1, 1959, and July 1, 1960, as provided by the Senate amendment.

"Minimum charge per piece on individually addressed copies of second-class mail publications mailed by publishers and news agents. Section 204 (b) of the conference substitute is similar, in general, to section 203 (c) of the Senate amendment, which provided three annual increases (instead of a single increase as provided by the House bill) in the minimum charge per piece on individually addressed copies of second-class mail publications mailed by publishers and news agents. However, the conference substitute provides that the three annual increases in such minimum charge per piece will become effective on January 1, 1959, January 1, 1960, and January 1, 1961, respectively, instead of July 1, 1958, July 1, 1959, and July 1, 1960, as provided by the Senate amendment.

"The conference substitute, like the House bill and the Senate amendment, exempts from any such increase in such minimum charge per piece the copies of publications mailed for delivery within the county of mailing.

"In addition, the conference substitute, in a manner identical to the manner provided by section 104 (b) of the House bill, provides that in no case shall the postage on each individually addressed copy of a publication mailed by certain types of nonprofit organizations, or on certain publications of a religious, educational, or scientific nature designed for instruction purposes, be less than the existing minimum charge per piece of one-eighth of 1 cent. The immediately preceding provision with respect to certain publications mailed by certain nonprofit organizations and certain publications for instruction purposes is adopted by the conference substitute in lieu of those provisions contained in section 203 (b) of the Senate amendment, which provided, in part, for certain percentage reductions in the regular minimum rate applicable to such organizations and publications and which is eliminated from the conference substitute.

"Transient second-class mail. Section 204 (c) of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of section 203 (d) of the Senate amendment, which proposed a rate increase for publications having second-class entry mailed by others than the publishers or authorized news agents or mailed as sample copies in excess of the 10 percent allowance at the publishers' rate, from the present rate of 2 cents for the first 2 ounces and 1 cent for each additional 2 ounces or fraction thereof to 2 cents for the first 2 ounces and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof.

"The effective date of the rate prescribed by section 204 (c) of the conference substitute is the first day of the first month which begins at least 40 days after the date of enactment of the conference substitute in lieu of the effective date of July 1, 1958, provided by the Senate amendment.

"Admission to second-class mail category of publications with board, cloth, leather, and other substantial bindings. Section 204 (d) of the conference substitute has the same purpose and effect as section 203 (e) of the Senate amendment (discussed above), which makes the second-class mailing privilege available to publications having substantial bindings. The House bill contained no such provision.

"Section 204 (d) of the conference substitute, like section 203 (e) of the Senate amendment, is effective on the date of enactment.

"Application of second-class mail rates to advertising portions of publications entered as second-class matter. Section 204 (e) of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of section 203 (f) of the Senate amendment (discussed above), which reaffirms certain existing law which requires the payment of second-class mail advertising rates on advertisements inserted in and attached permanently to a publication. The House bill contained no such provisions.

"Section 204 (e) of the conference substitute, like section 203 (f) of the Senate amendment, is effective on the date of enactment.

"Elimination of House provision for special 'break-even' publishers' and news agents' rates. The conference substitute, like the Senate amendment, does not contain any provision similar to section 104 (d) of the House bill (discussed above), which provided for special 'break-even' publishers' and news agents' rates.

"Elimination of Senate provision establishing regular pound and minimum rates less specified percentages for publications of certain nonprofit organizations and certain educational publications. The conference substitute, like the House bill, does not contain any provision similar to section 203 (b) of the Senate amendment (discussed above), which established the regular second-class mail pound and minimum rates reduced by certain specified percentages for publications of certain nonprofit organizations and certain educational publications.

"5. Controlled Circulation Publications

"Controlled circulation publications are publications which contain 24 pages or more, are issued at regular intervals of four or more times a year, have 25 percent or more of their pages devoted to text or reading matter and not more than 75 percent devoted to advertising, and are circulated free or mainly free.

"House bill and Senate amendment: Section 105 of the House bill and section 203 (g) of the Senate amendment amend section 203 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1262; 39 U. S. C. 291b) in which the Congress established a special uniform rate of 10 cents a pound or fraction thereof (regardless of the weight of the individual issue) computed on the entire bulk mailed at one time, but subject to a minimum rate of 1 cent per piece.

"The Postmaster General, with the concurrence of the Interstate Commerce Commission, increased the rate on controlled circulation publications weighing over eight ounces from 10 cents to 11 cents a pound or fraction thereof (291 I. C. C. 148; Docket 31074, 'Increased Parcel Post Rates,' 1953), thus distorting the uniform rate for such publications established by the Congress in the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment would correct this situation by establishing a uniform rate of 12 cents a pound or fraction thereof (regardless of the weight of the individual issue), subject to the existing minimum rate of 1 cent per piece, and by providing that the rates thus established for these publications '* * * shall remain in effect until otherwise provided by the Congress * * *.'

"Conference substitute: Section 204 (f) of the conference substitute contains the same provisions as the House bill and the Senate amendment with respect to controlled circulation publications, except that the effective date of the rates of postage provided by such section 204 (f) is the first day of the first month which begins at least 40 days after the date of enactment of the conference substitute.

"6. Third-Class Mail

"Third-class mail, which now has a limit of weight of 8 ounces, includes circulars, miscellaneous printed matter, merchandise, books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, plants, and other matter not in the first-class mail or second-class mail categories and weighing 8 ounces or less.

"House bill: Circulars, merchandise, miscellaneous printed matter, and other third-class matter generally (except books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants, and matter mailed in bulk). Section 106 of the House bill proposed an increase in the individual rate per piece on third-class mail matter generally from 2 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof (up to and including 8 ounces in weight) to 3 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof and

1½ cents for each additional ounce or fraction thereof (up to and including 8 ounces in weight). This increase was not applicable to books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants, and matter mailed in bulk.

"Books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants. Section 106 of the House bill also proposed an increase in the individual rate per piece on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants, from 2 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof and 1½ cents for each additional 2 ounces or fraction thereof (up to and including 8 ounces in weight) to 3 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof (up to and including 8 ounces in weight).

"Increase in third-class bulk mail permit fee. The third-class bulk mail privilege or so-called "bulk mailing service", as authorized by section 3 of the Act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 673; 39 U. S. C. 290a–1), involves the acceptance and transmission in the mails, upon payment of a fee of $10.00 for each calendar year or portion thereof and in accordance with certain regulations of the Postmaster General, of separately addressed identical pieces of third-class mail matter in quantities of not less than 20 pounds or of not less than 200 pieces, subject to the pound rates of postage applicable to the entire bulk mailed at one time.

"Section 106 of the House bill proposed an increase in such annual bulk mail permit fee from $10.00 to $20.00.

"Increase in third-class bulk mail rates generally (except books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants). Section 106 of the House bill also proposed an increase in the present rates on third-class bulk mail matter generally from 14 cents a pound or fraction thereof (with a minimum charge per piece of 1½ cents) to 16 cents a pound or fraction thereof (with a minimum charge per piece of 2½ cents). This increase did not apply to books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants.

"Increase in third-class bulk mail rates on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants. Section 106 of the House bill also proposed an increase in the present third-class bulk mail rates on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants from 10 cents a pound or fraction thereof (with a minimum charge per piece of 1½ cents) to 12 cents a pound or fraction thereof (with a minimum charge per piece of 2½ cents).

"Increase in minimum charge for odd-size pieces of third-class mail. Section 106 of the House bill also proposed an increase from 3 cents to 5 cents in the minimum charge on each odd-size piece of third-class mail—that is, a piece or package of such size or form as to prevent ready facing and tying in bundles and requiring individual distributing.

"Senate amendment: Increase in postage rate and maximum weight limitation on third-class mail matter generally. Section 204 of the Senate amendment proposed an increase in the individual rate per piece and the maximum weight limitation on third-class mail matter generally from 2 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof up to and including 8 ounces in weight, to 3 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof and 1½ cents for each additional ounce or fraction thereof, up to but not including 16 ounces in weight. These increases would have applied to third-class mail matter generally, such as circulars, miscellaneous printed matter, merchandise, books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants, but not to matter mailed in bulk.

"In effect, this provision of section 204 of the Senate amendment provided a uniform piece rate on single mailings for all third-class mail and changed the maximum weight limitation for third-class mail from "over 8 ounces" up to but not including 16 ounces.

"Increase in third-class bulk mail permit fee. Section 204 of the Senate amendment contained a provision (identical to a corresponding provision of section 106 of the House bill) which proposed an increase in the annual third-class bulk mail permit fee from $10.00 to $20.00.

"Increase in third-class bulk mail rates generally (except books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants). Section 204 of the Senate amendment proposed an increase in the existing rates on third-class bulk mail matter generally from 14 cents a pound or fraction thereof, with a minimum charge per piece of 1½ cents, to 16 cents a pound or fraction thereof, with a minimum charge per piece of 2 cents for the period beginning on July 1, 1958, and ending on June 30, 1959, and a minimum charge per piece of 2½ cents, effective on and after July 1, 1959. This increase did not apply to books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants.

"Increase in the third-class bulk mail minimum charge per piece on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants. Section 204 of the Senate amendment also proposed an increase in the existing third-class bulk mail minimum charge per piece on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants from 1½ cents to 2 cents for the period beginning on July 1, 1958, and ending on June 30, 1959, and 2½ cents, effective on and after July 1, 1959.

"Increase in minimum charge for odd-size pieces of third-class mail. Section 204 of the Senate amendment also proposed an increase from 3 cents to 6 cents in the minimum charge on each odd-size piece of third-class mail.

"Application of increased regular third-class mail rates to third-class mail matter of nonprofit organizations or associations, with 50 percent reduction in minimum charge per piece on bulk mail matter of such organizations or associations. Section 204 of the Senate amendment also made the regular third-class mail rates (as increased by section 204) applicable to the third-class matter mailed by nonprofit religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans' or fraternal organizations or associations. Section 204 also provided that the minimum charge per piece on the bulk mail matter of each such organization or association would be 50 percent of the regular minimum charge.

"The House bill made no change in the existing third-class mail rates with respect to such organizations and associations.

"Conference substitute: Increase in postage rate and maximum weight limitation on third-class mail matter generally. Section 205 (1) of the conference substitute, which adopts the provisions of section 204 (1) of the Senate amendment (discussed above), makes two significant changes with respect to postal rates on third-class mail matter.

"First, section 205 (1) of the conference substitute provides a uniform individual rate per piece on all third-class mail matter (except bulk mail matter), thus eliminating from existing law a separate individual per piece rate on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, roots, bulbs, scions, and plants.

"Second, such section 205 (1) increases the maximum weight limitation for third-class mail from "up to and including eight ounces" to "up to but not including 16 ounces".

"This increase in individual rate per piece and in maximum weight limitation is from 2 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof, up to and including 8 ounces in weight, to 3 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof and 1½ cents for each additional ounce or fraction thereof, up to but not including 16 ounces in weight. The increase provided by section 205 (1) of the conference substitute applies to individual pieces of third-class mail generally, such as circulars, miscellaneous printed matter, merchandise, books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants.

"Section 106 (1) of the House bill (discussed above) proposed an increase in the third-class mail individual rate per piece similar to the increase provided by the conference substitute, with two principal differences, as follows:

"First, section 106 (1) of the House bill proposed no change in maximum weight limitation for third-class mail.

"Second, such section 106 (1) proposed to retain a separate individual rate per piece on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants by providing for an increase in the existing separate per piece rate for the foregoing items from 2 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof and 1½ cents for each additional 2 ounces or fraction thereof (up to and including 8 ounces in weight) to 3 cents for the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof (up to and including 8 ounces in weight).

"The effective date of the rate adjustment provided by section 205 (1) of the conference substitute is the first day of the first month which begins at least 40 days after the date of enactment, in lieu of the effective dates of October 1, 1957, as provided by the House bill, and July 1, 1958, as provided by the Senate amendment.

"Increase in third-class bulk mail permit fee. Section 205 (2) of the conference substitute contains provisions identical to section 106 (2) of the House bill and section 204 (2) of the Senate amendment, both of which propose an increase in the third-class bulk mail permit fee from $10 to $20. The effective date of this increase in the third-class bulk mail permit fee is January 1, 1959, as provided by the conference substitute and the Senate amendment, in lieu of the comparable effective date of January 1, 1958 (now obsolete) provided by the House bill.

"Increase in third-class bulk mail rates generally (except books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants). Section 205 (3) of the conference substitute increases the existing rates on third-class bulk mail matter generally from 14 cents a pound or fraction thereof, with a minimum charge per piece of 1½ cents, to 16 cents a pound or fraction thereof, effective on and after January 1, 1959, with a minimum charge per piece of 2 cents for the period beginning on January 1, 1959, and ending on June 30, 1960, and a minimum charge per piece of 2½ cents, effective on and after July 1, 1960. These increases do not apply to books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants.

"Section 205 (3) of the conference substitute is similar to section 106 (3) of the House bill and section 204 (3) of the Senate amendment, except that, under the House bill, the increase in minimum charge per piece to 2½ cents was to be made in one step, effective on and after October 1, 1957, and, under the Senate amendment, while the increase in minimum charge per piece was to be made in two steps, the first increase was to become effective on July 1, 1958, rather than January 1, 1959, and the

second increase was to become effective on July 1, 1959, rather than July 1, 1960.

"Increase in third-class bulk mail minimum charge per piece on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants. Section 205 (3) (B) of the conference substitute increases the present third-class bulk mail minimum charge per piece on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants from 1½ cents to 2 cents for the period beginning on January 1, 1959, and ending on June 30, 1960, and 2½ cents, effective on and after July 1, 1960.

"This minimum charge per piece increase made by section 205 (3) (B) of the conference substitute is similar to the comparable increase provided by section 106 (3) (B) of the House bill and section 204 (3) (B) of the Senate amendment, except that, under the House bill, the increase in minimum charge per piece to 2½ cents was to be made in one step, effective on and after October 1, 1957, and, under the Senate amendment, while the increase in minimum charge per piece was to be made in two steps, the first increase was to become effective on July 1, 1958, rather than January 1, 1959, and the second increase was to become effective on July 1, 1959, rather than July 1, 1960.

"Elimination of House provision increasing third-class bulk mail pound rate on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants. Section 106 (3) (C) of the House bill proposed to increase the third-class bulk mail pound rate on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants from 10 cents a pound or fraction thereof to 12 cents a pound or fraction thereof.

"The conference substitute and the Senate amendment do not contain such provision.

"Increase in minimum charge for odd-size pieces of third-class mail. Section 205 (5) of the conference substitute, like section 204 (5) of the Senate amendment, increases from 3 cents to 6 cents the minimum charge on each odd-size piece of third-class mail. This increase provided by the conference substitute becomes effective on the first day of the first month which begins at least 40 days after the date of enactment of the conference substitute.

"Section 106 (5) of the House bill proposed to increase such minimum charge to 5 cents, effective on October 1, 1957.

"Application of increased regular third-class mail rates to third-class mail matter of nonprofit organizations or associations, with 50 percent reduction in minimum charge per piece on bulk mail matter of such organizations and associations. Section 205 (6) of the conference substitute makes the regular third-class mail rates, as increased by section 205, applicable on and after January 1, 1959, to the third-class matter mailed by nonprofit religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations and associations, except that the minimum charge per piece on the bulk mail matter of each such organization or association will be 50 percent of the regular minimum charge. Section 204 (6) of the Senate amendment contained a similar provision except that the effective date was July 1, 1958. The House bill contained no such provision.

"7. Fourth-class Mail

"Fourth-class mail, which now has a limit of weight of over 8 ounces to 70 pounds, in general includes merchandise, printed matter, and other mailable matter, which is not within the purview of any of the other classes of mail.

"House bill: Increase in the regular fourth-class mail preferential book rate and enlargement of categories of items eligible for such book rate. Section 107 of the House bill proposed an increase from 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof to 10 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof in the existing fourth-class mail postage rates for books generally.

"These fourth-class mail book rates are now applicable, however, only to those books which are permanently bound for preservation and consist wholly of reading matter or of reading matter with incidental blank spaces for students' notation and contain no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books. These rates also now apply to sixteen-millimeter films and sixteen-millimeter film catalogs when sent through the mails except when sent to commercial theaters.

"Section 107 proposed to enlarge the category of books eligible for this book rate, as increased by the House bill, by making specific reference to books consisting of 'scholarly bibliography.' Also, section 107 would enlarge the category of other items now eligible for the book rate so as to include, in addition to the sixteen-millimeter films and film catalogs, (A) printed music in bound form or sheet form, (B) certain types of printed objective test materials and accessories thereto used by or in behalf of educational institutions, and (C) manuscripts for books, periodical articles, and music.

"Extension of existing fourth-class mail library book rate. Section 107 of the House bill also proposed an extension of the so-called fourth-class library book rate.

"Section 204 (e) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 (39 U. S. C. 292a (e)) now provides the rate of 4 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof for books, consisting wholly of reading matter and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books, when sent by public libraries and nonprofit organizations or associations for certain library purposes and also when returned to such libraries, organizations, and associations. This rate is the so-called 'library book rate.' The library book rate also now applies to sixteen-millimeter films, filmstrips, projected transparencies and slides, microfilms, sound recordings, and catalogs of such materials when sent to or from (A) schools, colleges, universities, or public libraries and (B) nonprofit religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', and fraternal organizations or associations.

"Although section 107 of the House bill did not propose any increase in the library book rate, such section did propose an extension of such rate in three ways.

"First, section 107 proposed an enlargement of the category of items eligible for the library book rate to include (A) books consisting of 'scholarly bibliography or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for students' notations,' (B) printed music in bound form or sheet form, (C) bound volumes of academic theses in typewritten or other duplicated form, (D) bound volumes of periodicals, and (E) other library materials in printed, duplicated, or photographic form in the form of unpublished manuscripts.

"Second, section 107 proposed the extension of the library book rate (now applicable to eligible items sent to and from public libraries and nonprofit organizations or associations) to such items sent to and from schools, colleges, and universities and to nonprofit public libraries and nonprofit organizations and associations of the type listed above.

"Third, section 107 changed existing law, which now limits the application of the library book rate to mailings addressed for local delivery, or for delivery in the first, second, or third postal zone or in the State of mailing, so as to permit the application of the library book rate regardless of the postal zone of delivery.

"Senate amendment: Increase in minimum weight limitation for fourth-class mail. Section 205 (a) of the Senate amendment proposed an increase in the minimum weight limitation for fourth-class mail from 'over eight ounces' to sixteen ounces. This increase in the fourth-class mail minimum weight limitation conformed to the increase made by section 204 of the Senate amendment in the maximum weight limitation for third-class mail.

"In connection with the increase in the minimum weight limitation for fourth-class mail proposed by section 205 (a) of the Senate amendment, it may be noted that section 205 (c) of the Senate amendment proposed other conforming changes in existing law in order to reflect the increase in such minimum weight limitation.

"The House bill contained no such changes in the weight limitations for third-class mail and fourth-class mail.

"Enlargement of categories of items eligible for the regular fourth-class mail preferential book rate. Section 205 (b) of the Senate amendment proposed an enlargement of the categories of items now eligible for the regular fourth-class mail preferential book rate. These existing items are set forth above in connection with the discussion of the proposed enlargement by section 107 of the House bill of the eligibility of such items for the regular fourth-class mail preferential book rate, that is, books permanently bound and consisting of reading matter, etc., and certain sixteen-millimeter films and film catalogs.

"Section 205 (b) of the Senate amendment broadened this category of eligible items to include the same additional items as those proposed by section 107 of the House bill. In addition, section 205 (b) proposed the extension of the book rate to phonographic recordings.

"However, section 205 (b) did not contain a proposal (similar to that contained in the House bill) for an increase in the regular fourth-class mail preferential book rate.

"Extension of fourth-class mail library book rate. Section 205 (b) of the Senate amendment also contained a proposal to extend the fourth-class mail library book rate. This proposal was the same as the proposal contained in section 107 of the House bill (discussed above), except that, in addition, the Senate amendment proposed the extension of the library book rate to phonographic recordings.

"Conference substitute: Increase in minimum weight limitation for fourth-class mail. Sections 206 (a) and 206 (c) of the conference substitute adopt the provisions of section 205 (a) and section 205 (c) of the Senate amendment, which, in effect, increase the minimum weight limitation for fourth-class mail from "over eight ounces" to 16 ounces. The effective date of these provisions of the conference substitute is the first day of the first month which begins at least 40 days after the date of enactment of the conference substitute. The House bill contained no such provisions.

"Increase in the regular fourth-class mail preferential book rate and enlargement of categories of items eligible for such book rate. Section 206 (b) of the conference substitute increases from 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof to 9 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof the existing fourth-class mail postage rates for books generally. Section 107 of the House bill provided a comparable increase from 8 cents and 4 cents to 10 cents and 5 cents in the regular fourth-class mail preferential book rate. The Senate amendment contained no such increase.

"Section 206 (b) of the conference substitute also adopts those provisions of section

107 of the House bill and section 205 (b) of the Senate amendment which enlarge the category of books eligible for the regular book rate by including books consisting of "scholarly bibliography" and which enlarge the category of other items eligible for the regular book rate. These items are set forth in the discussion of section 107 of the House bill. In addition, section 206 (b) of the conference substitute extends the regular book rate to phonographic recordings, as provided in section 205 (b) of the Senate amendment.

"The effective date of the regular book rate provisions of section 206 (b) of the conference substitute is the first day of the first month which begins at least 40 days after the date of enactment of the conference substitute in lieu of October 1, 1957, as provided by the House bill, and July 1, 1958, as provided by the Senate amendment.

"Extension of fourth-class library book rate. Section 206 (b) of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of both section 107 of the House bill and section 205 (b) of the Senate amendment with respect to the extension of the fourth-class library book rate. This extension of the library book rate is discussed above in detail in connection with section 107 of the House bill. In addition, the conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment which extend the library book rate to phonographic recordings.

"The effective date of library book rate provisions of section 206 (b) of the conference substitute is the first day of the first month which begins at least 40 days after the date of enactment of the conference substitute in lieu of October 1, 1957, as provided by the House bill, and July 1, 1958, as provided by the Senate amendment.

"8. Mail to and From Army and Fleet Post Offices

"Senate amendment: Section 206 of the Senate amendment pertained to mail sent to and from Army and Fleet Post Offices.

"Section 206 (a) would permit, effective July 1, 1958, the transmission in the mails free of postage, under regulations of the Postmaster General, of admissible first-class letter mail sent by any person having an Army Post Office or Fleet Post Office address.

"Section 206 (b) would permit, effective July 1, 1958, the transmission in the mails at applicable existing postal rates, under regulations of the Postmaster General, any airmail and any package subject to third- or fourth-class rates, sent by any person having an Army Post Office or Fleet Post Office address.

"Section 206 (a) and (b) would apply with respect to both military and civilian personnel having Army Post Office or Fleet Post Office addresses.

"House bill: The House bill contained no such provision.

"Conference substitute: The conference substitute eliminates the provisions of section 206 of the Senate amendment.

"9. Books for the Blind

"Senate amendment: Section 207 of the Senate amendment proposed to amend the Act of October 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 737, 63 Stat. 690; 39 U. S. C. 331), which now grants the free mailing privilege in the case of books and other reading matter for the blind, without advertising, when sent by public institutions for the blind and by public libraries to blind individuals and when returned by such individuals to such institutions or libraries. Section 207 proposed to extend this free mailing privilege, effective July 1, 1958, in the case of certain books printed or typed in raised characters, without advertising, when furnished free by any person to a blind individual.

"House bill: The House bill contained no such provision.

"Conference substitute: Section 207 of the conference substitute contains provisions identical to section 207 of the Senate amendment and is effective on and after July 1, 1958.

"10. Subscription Order, Bill, and Receipt Forms

"Senate amendment: Section 208 of the Senate amendment proposed to amend that part of the first sentence of the Act of January 20, 1888 (25 Stat. 1; 39 U. S. C. 249), which authorized publishers and news agents to enclose in their publications bills, receipts, and orders for subscriptions to such publications but which contained the requirement that such notices should be in such form as to convey no information other than the name, place of publication, subscription price, and amount due. Section 208 proposed to eliminate this requirement from the law.

"House bill: The House bill contained no such provision.

"Conference substitute: Section 208 of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of section 208 of the Senate amendment and is effective on and after July 1, 1958.

"11. Investigations and Study of Dimensional Categories for First- and Third-Class Mail Envelopes and of Impact of Third-Class Bulk Rate Increases

"Senate amendment: Section 209 of the Senate amendment proposed an investigation and study by the Postmaster General of dimensional categories for first- and third-class mail envelopes.

"Section 209 (a) authorized and directed the Postmaster General to conduct a thorough investigation and study of the feasibility and desirability of—

"(1) establishing, by regulation of the Postmaster General, such number of categories (but not less than two categories) of specified standard length and width dimensions for those envelopes which are to be used for the transmission of first-class and third-class mail, as the Postmaster General may determine to be necessary or desirable to increase the efficient handling of the mail, and

"(2) establishing an additional charge on any such first-class or third-class mail matter which is transmitted in an envelope which does not conform to the standard dimensions so prescribed for envelopes.

"Section 209 (b) required that the Postmaster General submit to the Senate and House of Representatives, on or before February 1, 1959, a report on the results of his investigation and study under section 209 (a), together with his recommendations (including recommendations for any necessary legislation).

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions comparable to section 209 of the Senate amendment.

"However, the report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House which accompanied H. R. 5836, Eighty-fifth Congress (House Report No. 524, Eighty-fifth Congress, first session, page 30), discloses that the House committee has requested an investigation and study by the Postmaster General of dimensional categories for letter mail and certain third-class mail and that the House committee was informed by the Post Office Department that a report with respect to such dimensional categories would be submitted by the Department to the Congress.

"Conference substitute: Section 210 of the conference substitute contains the provisions of section 209 of the Senate amendment, relating to dimensional categories for envelopes. Section 210 of the conference substitute in effect carries out both the policy of section 209 of the Senate amendment and the intent of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House as disclosed by the House Report on H. R. 5836.

"The conference substitute also contains a provision (sec. 209) requiring the Secretary of Commerce and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to undertake independent studies to ascertain the effect on small business enterprises, on users of the mails, and on the national economy generally of the increases in third-class bulk mailing pound rates on circulars and merchandise and the third-class bulk mailing minimum piece charge, provided by section 205 (3) of the conference agreement. Each of the above agencies would be required to submit to the Congress on or before March 1, 1960, a report of its study together with such recommendations as it may consider necessary and appropriate.

"12. Determination of Class of Post Office and Compensation of Postmaster and Certain Employees

"House bill: Section 108 of the House bill provided, in effect, that the determination of classes of post offices, and the determination of the compensation and allowances of postmasters and other employees whose compensation or allowances are based on the gross annual receipts of their respective post offices, shall be made on the basis of 82 percent of the gross postal receipts of their respective post offices accruing on or after October 1, 1957. Section 108 also contained a provision designed to protect a post office from the possibility of being relegated to a lower class or receipts category in certain cases.

"The purpose of section 108 of the House bill was to maintain, to the extent appropriate, the present classes of post offices, and to avoid disturbance of existing compensation relationships among postmasters and employees whose salaries or allowances are based in whole or in part on postal receipts. The 82 percent adjustment factor would have applied equally to all classes of post offices. Any possible adverse effects of applying this adjustment to offices where the receipts were not affected by rate increases to the extent anticipated would have been prevented by the savings provision.

"Senate amendment: Section 210 of the Senate amendment provided, in effect, that no part of the gross postal receipts of any post office (which receipts are determined in accordance with estimates of the Postmaster General to be attributable to the increases in postage rates provided by the Senate amendment) shall be counted for the purpose of determining the classes of post offices and the compensation and allowances of postmasters and other employees whose compensations or allowances are based on the gross annual receipts of such post offices. Under this language, the Postmaster General would have been authorized to establish the adjustment factor or factors to be applied to all offices or to classes of offices. Section 210 also contained a savings provision (similar in principle to the comparable provision of section 108 of the House bill) the purpose of which was to protect a post office from relegation to a lower class or receipts category where, because of variations in revenue sources, increased postal rates did not yield increases in gross postal receipts comparable to the estimated average increase.

"Conference substitute: Section 108 of the House bill and section 210 of the Senate amendment both provided, in effect, that the increased revenues derived from the postal rate increases proposed by the House and the Senate, respectively, shall be excluded in determining the compensation and allowances of postmasters and other employees and in determining the classes of post offices. Existing law provides for such determinations on the basis of 100 percent of gross postal receipts. The House bill prescribed a basis of 82 percent of gross postal receipts for the making of such determinations. The Senate amendment required

that such determinations be made in accordance with estimates of the Postmaster General.

"Section 211 of the conference substitute, which becomes effective on the date of enactment, adopts the provisions of section 210 of the Senate amendment.

"13. Repeal of Existing Law

"House bill: Retirement contributions of Post Office Department. Section 109 of the House bill proposed the repeal of an existing provision of section 4 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (70 Stat. 747; 5 U. S. C. 2254 (a)) which reads as follows: "Amounts contributed under this subsection from appropriations of the Post Office Department shall not be considered as costs of providing postal service for the purpose of establishing postal rates."

"In effect, the proposed repeal of this provision would remove from the law a provision which excludes civil service retirement contributions by the Post Office Department from consideration as postal costs in the establishment of postal rates.

"In addition, in order to clarify the intent and effect of such repeal, section 109 contained an affirmative statement to the effect that the amounts contributed by the Post Office Department to the civil service retirement and disability fund in compliance with section 4 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be considered as costs of providing postal service for the purpose of establishing postal rates.

"Section 109 was to be effective as of the effective date of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956—that is, as of October 1, 1956.

"The House bill did not contain an express repeal of any other provisions of law relating to postal rates.

"Senate amendment: Retirement contributions of Post Office Department. Section 213 of the Senate amendment contained, among other provisions, a provision identical to section 109 of the House bill (civil service retirement contributions of Post Office Department). However, the effective date of the Senate provision was to be July 1, 1958, rather than October 1, 1956.

"Other provisions of law: Section 213 of the Senate amendment proposed the repeal of four additional provisions of law (relating to postal rates) which are either obsolete or are affected by other rate provisions of the Senate amendment.

"First, section 213 would repeal the Act of June 9, 1930 (39 U. S. C. 793), which requires annual certification by the Postmaster General to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Comptroller General of the United States of the estimated amount of the loss incurred by the postal service on free or reduced rate mailings. This requirement (now in part obsolete) is made wholly unnecessary by procedures contained in both the Senate amendment and the House bill.

"Second, section 213 would repeal paragraph (4) of section 202 (a) of the Act of February 28, 1925 (45 Stat. 941; 39 U. S. C. 283 (4)). This paragraph (4), which is now obsolete, provides a graduated scale of rates for second-class publications based on the number of individually addressed copies to the pound. No corresponding repeal is contained in the House bill.

"Third, section 213 would repeal section 202 (b) of the Act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1066; 39 U. S. C. 283 (b)), which section 202 (b) makes the editorial rate on second-class publications applicable to advertising in any single issue in which the advertising portion does not exceed 5 percent of the entire content. This repeal would be necessary in order to make the conforming changes in the law which are made necessary by reason of the change in second-class mail rates proposed by the Senate amendment.

"Fourth, section 213 would repeal section 204 of the Act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1067; 39 U. S. C. 288). This repeal (not contained in the Houes bill) would eliminate a special postage rate which applies to any one edition or issue of a publication weighing not in excess of 1 pound and mailed to any one zone.

"Conference substitute: Retirement contributions of Post Office Department. Section 214 (b) of the conference substitute, relating to retirement contributions of the Post Office Department, is identical with section 109 of the House bill and section 213 (5) of the Senate amendment. However, the effective date provided by the conference substitute is October 1, 1956, the same as that provided by the House bill, rather than July 1, 1958, the date provided by the Senate amendment.

"Repeal of other provisions of law. Section 214 (a) of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of paragraphs (1) to (4), inclusive, of section 213 (a) of the Senate amendment which would repeal certain specified provisions of law. These provisions are set forth above in the discussion of section 213 of the Senate amendment.

"14. Automatic Salary Step Increases for Postal Field Service Employees

"Senate amendment: Section 211 of the Senate amendment proposed two changes (to be effective on the date of enactment) in section 401 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 122; 39 U. S. C. 981). Such section 401 relates to automatic advancement by step increases for postal field service employees.

"First, section 211 (a) of the Senate amendment proposed to eliminate the provision in subsection (a) of such section 401, which at present excludes, from the general provision pertaining to periodic advancement to the maximum step of the salary level of the employee based on each fifty-two weeks of satisfactory service, those employees whose positions are allocated to salary levels above salary level PFS–9 in the Postal Field Service Schedule.

"Second, section 211 (b) of the Senate amendment proposed the repeal of subsection (b) of such section 401, which provides for salary step increases up to and including step 4 of the salary level concerned, based on each fifty-two calendar weeks of satisfactory service, for those employees whose positions are allocated to salary level PFS–10 or a higher salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule, and for advancement of such employees to steps higher than step 4 (but excluding longevity steps) of the salary level concerned on the basis of superior performance of the employee under regulations issued by the Postmaster General. The provisions of subsection (b) of such section 401 apply primarily to those postmasters, supervisors, and other managerial personnel of the postal field service who are in the higher salary levels of the Postal Field Service Schedule.

"The overall effect of these changes proposed by the Senate amendment in such section 401 is (A) the repeal of the existing requirement that step increases or advancements in salary level PFS–10 or a higher salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule will be granted only under regulations of the Postmaster General on the basis of the superior performance of the employee concerned, and (B) the establishment of a new requirement that all step increases or advancements under such section 401 be automatic irrespective (except as provided by subsection (c) of such section 401) of the salary step or salary level concerned.

"The changes in such section 401 proposed by section 211 of the Senate amendment require the advancement of each employee in salary level PFS–10 or higher to that step of his salary level which he would have attained except for the limitations contained in section 401 which would be eliminated from that section by section 211 of the Senate amendment.

"In addition, these changes in such section 401 require the advancement, on the date of enactment of the conference substitute, of an employee of one step for each 52 weeks of satisfactory service standing to the credit of the employee since the date of his last automatic advancement (excluding advancement on the basis of superior performance) or equivalent increase in basic salary. No retroactive compensation or salary will be payable by reason of the enactment of section 211 of the conference substitute.

"The following example illustrates the application and operation of the changes proposed by section 211 of the Senate amendment in section 401 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955.

"Employee X who was within the purview of subsection (b) of such section 401 by reason of the allocation of his position to salary level PFS–10 and who was in step 4 of such salary level became eligible for consideration for advancement to step 5 of such level on January 12, 1957, but was denied such advancement under the regulations of the Postmaster General concerning superior performance. However, he was granted such advancement to step 5 of such salary level six months later, on July 13, 1957, under such regulations, because of his superior performance in the interim period.

"As a result of the changes in section 401 proposed by the Senate amendment, employee X would receive an automatic advancement to step 6 of such salary level (if the conditions of service are met and if no equivalent increase was received after January 12, 1957), on the date of enactment of the Senate amendment. Such employee then would receive an automatic advancement to step 7 of such salary level on January 10, 1959, if the conditions of service are met and if no equivalent increase was received after January 11, 1958.

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions similar to section 211 of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Section 212 of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of section 211 of the Senate amendment.

"15. Reformation of Certain Matters Pertaining to Fourth-class Mail; Conditions Precedent to Withdrawal From General Fund of Treasury

"House bill: Conditions precedent to withdrawal from general fund of Treasury. An existing provision of chapter IV of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (64 Stat. 1050; 31 U. S. C. 695), prohibits the withdrawal (whenever fourth-class mail costs exceed fourth-class mail revenues) from the general fund of the Treasury of funds appropriated to the Post Office Department until the Postmaster General has certified that he has requested the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the establishment of such rate increases or other reformations as will insure the receipt of fourth-class mail revenue sufficient to pay the cost of fourth-class mail service.

"Section 110 of the House bill proposed to amend this provision of law so as to require, in effect, that the Postmaster General shall petition the Interstate Commerce Commission for such fourth-class mail rate increases and other reformations as may be necessary to insure that the fourth-class mail revenues will not exceed the fourth-class mail costs by more than 1 percent and that the fourth-class mail costs will not exceed the fourth-class mail revenues by more than 1 percent.

"The purpose of the amendment proposed by section 110 of the House bill is to facilitate and assist the operation and administration of the established policy of the Congress that fourth-class mail pay its own way.

"The House bill contained no amendment (similar to that contained in section 212 (a)

of the Senate amendment) to section 207 (b) of the Act of February 28, 1925 (45 Stat. 942; 39 U. S. C. 247), relating to reformation of matters pertaining to fourth-class mail.

"Senate amendment: Conditions precedent to withdrawal from general fund of Treasury. Section 212 (b) of the Senate amendment proposed an amendment comparable to that proposed by section 110 of the House bill. The Senate amendment, however, required that the Postmaster General shall certify that he has requested the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the establishment of such fourth-class mail rate increases or other reformations as may be necessary to insure that the cost of fourth-class mail service will not exceed by more than 8 percent the revenues from such service.

"Reformation of certain matters pertaining to fourth-class mail. Section 212 (a) of the Senate amendment proposed an amendment to section 207 (b) of the Act of February 28, 1925 (45 Stat. 942; 39 U. S. C. 247). Such section 207 (b) provides that, if the Postmaster General finds that the classification of mail matter, the weight limits, the zone or zones, or other conditions of mailability pertaining to fourth-class mail are such as to prevent the shipment of desirable articles or to render permanently the cost of the fourth-class mail service greater than the revenue from such service, he is directed, subject to the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission after investigation, to reform such classifications, weight limits, zone or zones, or conditions in order to promote the service or to insure the receipt of revenue from fourth-class mail service adequate to pay the cost of such service.

"Existing law, therefore, directs that the Postmaster General seek an increase in fourth-class mail rates if he finds that fourth-class mail costs will exceed fourth-class mail revenues permanently by any amount.

"Under the amendment proposed by section 212 (a) of the Senate amendment the Postmaster General is required to seek an increase in fourth-class mail rates if he finds that fourth-class mail costs will exceed fourth-class mail revenues permanently by more than 8 percent.

"The Senate amendment did not establish any specific authority in the law for the Postmaster General to seek an increase in fourth-class mail rates unless and until he finds that fourth-class mail costs will exceed fourth-class mail revenues by more than 8 percent. However, the explanation of the Senate provision contained on page 12 of Senate Report No. 1321, Eighty-fifth Congress, second session, indicated that there was no legislative intent to preclude the Postmaster General from seeking a fourth-class mail rate revision on his own initiative if he finds that fourth-class mail costs will exceed fourth-class mail revenues permanently by less than 8 percent.

"Conference substitute: Section 213 of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of section 110 of the House bill, except that the variance of 1 percent provided by the House bill is changed to 4 percent in the conference substitute.

"16. Effective Dates for Postal Rate Provisions

"Section 111 of the House bill and section 214 of the Senate amendment contained the effective dates for the respective House and Senate postal rate and related provisions.

"Section 215 of the conference substitute contains the comparable effective dates agreed to in conference.

"These effective dates are set forth in the table below:

"Effective dates

	House bill	Senate amendment	Conference substitute
All rate adjustments (except as indicated below).	Oct. 1, 1957	July 1, 1958	Aug. 1, 1958.
Second class publishers pound rates	Oct. 1, 1957, July 1, 1958, July 1, 1959, July 1, 1960.	July 1, 1958, July 1, 1959, July 1, 1960.	Jan. 1, 1959, Jan. 1, 1960, Jan. 1, 1961.
Second class minimum piece charge	Oct. 1, 1957	July 1, 1958, July 1, 1959, July 1, 1960.	Jan. 1, 1959, Jan. 1, 1960, Jan. 1, 1961.
Third-class individual piece rates	Oct. 1, 1957	July 1, 1958	Aug. 1, 1958.
Third-class pound rate, circulars and merchandise, etc.	Oct. 1, 1957	July 1, 1958	Jan. 1, 1959.
Third-class bulk mailing permit fee	Jan. 1, 1958	Jan. 1, 1959	Jan. 1, 1959.
Third-class bulk mailing minimum piece charge.	Oct. 1, 1957	July 1, 1958, July 1, 1959.	Jan. 1, 1959, July 1, 1960.
Weight limitation, third and fourth class		July 1, 1958	Aug. 1, 1958.
Repeal of retirement cost provision	Oct. 1, 1956	July 1, 1958	Oct. 1, 1956.
Repeal of exemption from advertising rates of publications having not more than 5 percent advertising content.		July 1, 1958	Jan. 1, 1959.
Repeal of other laws		July 1, 1958	Date of enactment.
All other provisions	Date of enactment	Date of enactment	Do.

"Postal rate policy

"Title II of the House bill and title I of the Senate amendment each set forth a postal rate policy to serve as a guide in the determination and adjustment of postal rates by the Congress.

"The postal rate policy provisions of the conference substitute are contained in title I of the conference substitute.

"1. Short Title

"House bill: Section 201 of the House bill provided for title II of the House bill the short title 'Postal Rate Policy Act'.

"Senate amendment: Section 101 of the Senate amendment provided for title I of the Senate amendment the short title 'Postal Policy Act of 1958'.

"Conference substitute: The conference substitute adopts the Senate short title 'Postal Policy Act of 1958'.

"2. Findings

"Section 202 of the House bill contained seven paragraphs which set forth certain findings of the Congress which would form the basis for the formal statement of postal rate policy in title II of the House bill. These findings related to the historical background, development, and expansion of the postal service, the contribution of the postal service to the public welfare and the national economy, the necessity of continuing those postal services which contribute to the public welfare, the manner of performing those services, and the necessity for a declaration of Congressional policy to serve as a basis for a sound and equitable postal-rate structure.

"Section 102 of the Senate amendment contained six paragraphs of the same general import as section 202 of the House bill.

"The Congressional findings set forth in these paragraphs of section 202 of the House bill and of section 102 of the Senate amendment, and the comparable provisions of the conference substitute, are discussed below.

"A. Purpose of creation of postal establishment.

"House bill, Senate amendment, conference substitute: Paragraph (1) of section 202 of the House bill, paragraph (1) of section 102 of the Senate amendment, and paragraph (1) of section 102 of the conference substitute each state that the postal establishment was created in order to (A) unite more closely the American people, (B) promote the general welfare, and (C) advance the national economy.

"B. Enlargement of postal establishment.

"House bill: Paragraph (2) of section 202 of the House bill stated that the postal establishment has been extended and enlarged through the years into a nationwide network of services and facilities for (A) the communication of intelligence, (B) the dissemination of information, (C) the advancement of education and culture, and (D) the distribution of articles of commerce and industry.

"Senate amendment: Paragraph (2) of section 102 of the Senate amendment is identical to paragraph (2) of section 202 of the House bill, but contains an additional sentence to the effect that the Congress has encouraged the use of postal services and facilities by providing reasonable and in many cases, special postal rates.

"Conference substitute: Paragraph (2) of section 102 of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of paragraph (2) of section 102 of the Senate amendment.

"C. Contribution of postal services to the development of the national economy.

"House bill, Senate amendment, conference substitute: Paragraph (3) of section 202 of the House bill, paragraph (3) of section 102 of the Senate amendment, and paragraph (3) of section 102 of the conference substitute each state that the development and expansion of the several elements of postal service, under the authorization of Congress, have been the impelling force in the formation and development of many and varied business enterprises which contribute to the national economy and the public welfare and which depend upon the continued operation of these elements of postal service.

"D. Relationships among the several classes of mail; performance of certain postal functions on the basis of the national welfare.

"House bill: Paragraph (a) of section 202 of the House bill recognized that, in the operations of the postal establishment authorized by the Congress, there have developed certain relationships among the several classes of mail. These relationships, now recognized and accepted, have developed through the years in the public interest and as manifestations of public policy.

"In addition, paragraph (4) recognized that the postal establishment performs some functions in which the public interest outweighs the profit and loss factors which would be controlling if the postal establishment were operated solely as a business enterprise. This public interest factor in postal operations is apparent in the continued expansion of the postal service and in the authorization of the rendition of certain services and the provision of certain facilities at a calculated loss to the Federal Government.

"Senate amendment: Paragraph (4) of section 102 of the Senate amendment also recognized the existence of relationships among the several classes of mail.

"In addition, the Senate version stated that it is clear, from the continued expansion of the postal service and from the continued encouragement by the Congress of the most widespread use of the postal service, that the postal establishment performs many functions and offers its facilities to many users on a basis which can only be justified as being in the interest of the national welfare.

"Although paragraph (4) of section 102 of the Senate amendment contains different language than paragraph (4) of section 202 of the House bill, the import of the language in both House and Senate versions is similar.

"Conference substitute: Paragraph (4) of section 102 of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 102 of the Senate amendment.

"E. Expenses chargeable to mail users.

"House bill: Paragraph (5) of section 202 of the House bill stated that it would be an unfair burden on the mail users to compel them to underwrite those expenses incurred by the postal establishment which are not related to those postal services which such mail users receive. This statement was based on the premise that the postal service should be operated in a businesslike manner but clearly is not a commercial enterprise conducted for profit.

"Senate amendment: Paragraph (5) of section 102 of the Senate amendment stated that it would be an unfair burden on any particular mail user or class of mail users to compel them to bear the expenses incurred by reason of special rate considerations granted or facilities provided to other mail users or to underwrite those expenses incurred by the postal establishment for services of a nonpostal nature. This statement was based on the premise that, while the postal establishment, as all other Government agencies, should be operated in an efficient manner, it clearly is not a business enterprise conducted for profit or for raising general funds.

"Conference substitute: Paragraph (5) of section 102 of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of paragraph (5) of section 102 of the Senate amendment.

"F. Recognition of lack of firm policy statement with respect to identification of postal services.

"House bill: Paragraph (6) of section 202 of the House bill stated that, notwithstanding the need therefor, the Congress has not laid down a firm policy to identify and evaluate postal services rendered, in whole or in part, for the benefit of the general public or for the benefit of certain mail users.

"Senate amendment: The Senate amendment contained no such provision.

"Conference substitute: The conference substitute, like the Senate amendment, contains no provision similar to paragraph (6) of section 202 of the House bill.

"G. Need for declaration by the Congress of a postal rate policy.

"House bill: Paragraph (7) of section 202 of the House bill stated that the public interest and the increasing complexity of the social and economic fabric of the Nation require an immediate, clear, and affirmative declaration of Congressional policy for the creation and maintenance of a sound and equitable postal-rate structure which would assure efficient service, produce adequate postal revenues, and stand the test of time.

"Senate amendment: Paragraph (6) of section 102 of the Senate amendment, like paragraph (7) of section 202 of the House bill, declared an immediate need for a declaration of Congressional policy with respect to postal rates. However, unlike the House version, paragraph (6) of section 102 of the Senate amendment made specific reference to the public service activities of the postal establishment as the basis for the creation and maintenance of a sound and equitable postal-rate structure.

"Conference substitute: Paragraph (6) of section 102 of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of paragraph (6) of section 102 of the Senate amendment.

"3. Declaration of Policy

"Section 203 of the House bill, section 103 of the Senate amendment, and section 103 of the conference substitute set forth the declaration of policy by the Congress with respect to the postal-rate structure and, in connection therewith, stated certain general principles, standards, and related requirements with respect to the determination and allocation of postal revenues and expenses and with respect to the adjustment of the postal-rate structure generally.

"A. Constitutional function of the Congress in forming postal policy; general statement of Congressional policy.

"House bill: Subsections (a) and (b) of section 203 of the House bill related generally to the constitutional function of the Congress in forming postal policy.

"Subsection (a) of section 203 stated that the Congress hereby emphasizes, reaffirms, and restates its function under the Constitution of the United States of forming postal policy.

"Subsection (b) of section 203 set forth two main points of Congressional policy with respect to the postal-rate structure, as follows:

"First, it is the policy of the Congress to provide a more stable basis for the postal-rate structure through the establishment of principles, standards, and related requirements with respect to the determination and allocation of postal revenues and expenses.

"Second, it is the policy of the Congress, in accordance with these principles, standards, and requirements, to provide a means for the adjustment of the postal-rate structure by action of the Congress, from time to time, as the public interest may require, in the light of periodic reviews of the postal-rate structure, periodic studies and surveys of expenses and revenues, and certain periodic reports and recommendations required to be made by the Postmaster General, on the basis of the cost ascertainment system of the Post Office Department.

"Senate amendment: Subsections (a) and (b) of section 103 of the Senate amendment also related generally to the constitutional function of the Congress in forming postal policy, although the language of the Senate version is different from the language of the House version.

"Subsection (a) of section 103 of the Senate amendment declared, as a matter of policy, that in order to establish a more stable basis for the postal-rate structure through principles, standards, and related requirements similar to those referred to in the House version, the Congress hereby emphasizes, reaffirms, and restates its constitutional function of forming postal policy. However, the Senate version contained no reference to a cost ascertainment system.

"Subsection (b) of section 103 of the Senate amendment declared it to be the policy of the Congress that the post office is a public service.

"Conference substitute: Subsections (a) and (b) of section 103 of the conference substitute contain the same language as subsections (a) and (b) of section 203 of the House bill with the following changes:

"First, paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 103 of the conference substitute contains the provision of subsection (b) of section 103 of the Senate amendment to the effect that it is declared to be the policy of the Congress that the post office is a public service.

"Second, paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 103 of the conference substitute omits specific reference to the cost ascertainment system as a basis for the adjustment of the postal-rate structure.

"Third, such paragraph (2) also omits specific reference to recommendations of the Postmaster General.

"B. General principles, standards, and related requirements with respect to the determination and allocation of postal revenues and expenses.

"Subsection (c) of section 203 of the House bill and subsection (c) of section 103 of the Senate amendment each prescribe general principles, standards, and related requirements with respect to the determination and allocation of postal revenues and expenses. These principles, standards, and related requirements are divided into four categories, as follows:

"First, a specification of matters to be given due consideration in the determination and adjustment of the postal-rate structure.

"Second, a statement with respect to first-class mail.

"Third, a statement with respect to the assumption by the Federal Government of the cost of public service items.

"Fourth, a statement with respect to postal revenues and postal expenses in connection with the adjustment of postal rates.

"i. Specifications of matters to be given due consideration in the determination and adjustment of the postal-rate structure.

"House bill, Senate amendment, conference substitute: Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 203 of the House bill, paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 103 of the Senate amendment, and paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 103 of the conference substitute are identical provisions which specify the matters to be given due consideration in the determination and adjustment of the postal-rate structure. These matters are as follows:

"(a) the promotion of social, cultural, intellectual, and commercial communications among the people of the United States of America;

"(b) the development and maintenance of a postal service which will serve the present and future needs of the people of the United States of America;

"(c) the promotion of adequate, economical, and efficient postal service at reasonable and equitable rates and fees;

"(d) the effect of postal services and the impact of postal rates and fees on users of the mails;

"(e) the requirements of the postal establishment with respect to the manner and form of preparation and presentation of mail matter by the users of the various classes of mail service;

"(f) the value of mail;

"(g) the value of time of delivery of mail; and

"(h) the quality and character of the service rendered in terms of priority, secrecy, security, speed of transmission, use of facilities and manpower, and other pertinent service factors.

"ii. Statement with respect to first-class mail.

"House bill: Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 203 of the House bill provided, in effect, that the first-class mail service is a preferred service of the postal establishment, the postage rates for which should cover both its allocated costs and an additional amount representing the fair value of all extraordinary and preferential services, facilities, and factors relating thereto.

"Senate amendment: Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 103 of the Senate amendment provided, in effect, that the first-class mail service is the primary function of the postal establishment, the costs of which shall be the expenses allocated to first-class mail plus the amount of the fair value of all extraordinary and preferential services, specially designed facilities, and other related factors.

"Conference substitute: Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 103 of the conference substitute adopts the provision of paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 203 of the House bill.

"iii. Statement with respect to assumption by Federal Government of the cost of public service items.

"House bill, Senate amendment, conference substitute: Paragraph (3) of subsection (c) of section 203 of the House bill, paragraph (3) of subsection (c) of section 103 of the Senate amendment, and paragraph

(3) of subsection (c) of section 103 of the conference substitute each provide that the sum of the public service items, provided by the postal establishment and as determined by the Congress, shall be assumed directly by the Federal Government, paid directly out of the general fund of the Treasury, and not be charged to any user or users of the mails in the form of rates and fees. The House bill, Senate amendment, and conference substitute each provide that nothing contained in the respective postal rate policy provisions of such versions should be construed as indicating any intention on the part of the Congress that any such public services should be limited or restricted or as indicating any Congressional intent to derogate in any way from the need or desirability of such services in the public interest.

"iv. Statement with respect to postal revenues and postal expenses in connection with the adjustment of postal rates.

"House bill: Paragraph (4) of subsection (c) of section 203 of the House bill provided that postal rates should be adjusted from time to time so that the total amount of postal revenues (including appropriations for public service items) shall more nearly equal total expenses (including expenses for public service items), as determined on the basis of the cost ascertainment system of the Post Office Department.

"Senate amendment: Paragraph (4) of subsection (c) of section 103 of the Senate amendment provided that postal rates and fees shall be adjusted from time to time so that the total amount of all postal revenues (excluding appropriations for public service items) shall be approximately equal to the total amount of the nonpublic service expenses of the postal establishment.

"Conference substitute: Paragraph (4) of subsection (c) of section 103 of the conference substitute provides that postal rates and fees shall be adjusted from time to time as may be required to produce that amount of revenue which is approximately equal to the total cost of operating the postal establishment minus that amount which is deemed to be attributable to the performance of the public service items enumerated under subsection (b) of section 104 of the conference substitute, relating to authorization of certain appropriations to reimburse the Post Office Department on account of public services of the Department.

"4. Identification of and Appropriations for Public Services

"Section 104 of the Senate amendment contained provisions which identified certain services of the postal service as public service items which are to be financed by the Federal Government and for which the Post Office Department is to be reimbursed by certain appropriations each fiscal year to cover the costs of such items.

"The House bill contained no such identification of public service items but section 204 thereof did contain a provision authorizing appropriations to cover the costs of public service items generally.

"Identification of public services

"Senate amendment: Subsection (a) of section 104 of the Senate amendment identifies those public service items the sum of which is to be assumed directly by the Federal Government and paid out of the general fund of the Treasury.

"Paragraph (1) of such subsection (a) identifies as public services the total loss resulting from the transmission in the mails free of postage or at reduced rates of postage of certain matter under certain provisions of law which are specified in such paragraph. Those provisions of law are referred to in detail in the discussion of a similar provision identifying public service items which is contained in the conference substitute.

"Paragraphs (2) to (8), inclusive, of such subsection (a) describe as items of public service certain categories of losses and costs in the mail service. These losses and costs are described in general terms and without reference to specific provisions of law, as follows:

"In paragraph (2), the loss resulting from the operation of such public welfare postal services as the star route system, rural free delivery, and third- and fourth-class post offices.

"In paragraph (3), the loss incurred in performing nonpostal services, such as the sale of documentary stamps for the Department of the Treasury.

"In paragraph (4), the loss incurred in performing special services, such as cash on delivery, insured mail, special delivery, and money orders.

"In paragraph (5), the cost of the free handling of registered mail for the post office and other Federal agencies.

"In paragraph (6), the cost of transportation subsidies borne by the postal establishment in compliance with or resulting from the nonenforcement of Federal statutes.

"In paragraph (7), the additional cost of transporting United States mail by foreign air carriers at a Universal Postal Union rate in excess of the rate prescribed for United States carriers.

"In paragraph (8), other services provided in the interests of the public welfare, the costs of which exceed revenues therefrom.

"House bill: The House bill contained no identification of public service items similar to subsection (a) of section 104 of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Subsection (a) of section 104 of the conference substitute contains an identification of public service items which is similar to the public service identification provisions contained in subsection (a) of section 104 of the Senate amendment, except for the following changes:

"First, paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 104 of the conference substitute identifies as public services the total loss resulting from the transmission in the mails free of postage or at reduced rates of postage of certain matter under the following provisions of law:

"(a) section 202 (a) (3) of the Act of February 28, 1925 (39 U. S. C. 283 (a) (3)), relating to reduced postage rates on newspapers or periodicals of certain nonprofit organizations;

"(b) sections 5 and 6 of the Act of March 3, 1877 (39 U. S. C. 321), relating to official mail matter of the Pan American Union sent free through the mails;

"(c) section 25 of the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (39 U. S. C. 286), and section 2 (b) of the Act of October 30, 1951 (39 U. S. C. 289a (b)), relating to free-in-county mailing privileges;

"(d) certain provisions of law as contained in the Act of October 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 737; Public Law 270, Seventy-seventh Congress) and as amended by the Act of September 7, 1949 (63 Stat. 690), relating to free postage and reduced postage rates on reading matter and other articles for the blind (39 U. S. C. 331);

"(e) the Act of February 14, 1929 (39 U. S. C. 336), granting free mailing privileges to the diplomatic corps of the countries of the Pan American Postal Union;

"(f) the Act of April 15, 1937 (39 U. S. C. 293c), granting reduced rates to publications for use of the blind;

"(g) the Act of June 29, 1940 (39 U. S. C. 321–1), granting free mailing privileges to the Pan American Sanitary Bureau;

"(h) the act of May 7, 1945 (59 Stat. 707), and other provisions of law granting free mailing privileges to individuals;

"(i) the second and third provisos of section 2 (a) of the Act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 672; 39 U. S. C. 289a (a)), granting reduced second-class postage rates to publications of certain nonprofit organizations;

"(j) the last proviso of section 3 of the Act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 673; 39 U. S. C. 290a–1), granting reduced third-class postage rates to certain organizations;

"(k) section 302 of The Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (5 U. S. C. 2192), granting free postage, including free airmail postage, to post cards, ballots, voting instructions, and envelopes transmitted in the mails under authority of such Act; and

"(l) section 204 (d) and (e) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, as amended (39 U. S. C. 292a (d) and (e)), including the amendment made by section 206 of the conference substitute.

"The provisions of law above referred to are the same as those referred to in the comparable provision of the Senate amendment. All changes made by the conference substitute with respect to such provisions of law are of a technical and clarifying nature only.

"Second, paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 104 of the conference substitute describes as an item of public service the loss resulting from the operation of such prime and necessary public services as the star route system and third- and fourth-class post offices. The language of such paragraph (2) differs from the language of paragraph (2) of section 104 (a) of the Senate amendment in two respects:

"(1) the reference in the Senate amendment to 'public welfare postal services' is changed in the conference substitute to 'prime and necessary public services'; and

"(2) the conference substitute eliminates the reference in the Senate amendment to rural free delivery.

"In connection with this elimination of the reference to rural free delivery the following statement should be noted.

"The conference substitute eliminates from section 104 (a) (2) the language, contained in the Senate amendment, which would exclude losses on rural routes from postal costs for postal rate purposes. The determination to exclude the loss on rural routes from section 104 (a) (2) of the conference substitute was based upon a decision of the committee of conference that this matter be passed over as an unresolved issue, without prejudice to further legislative consideration and action with respect to the exclusion of the loss on rural routes from postal costs for postal rate purposes by reason of such loss constituting a public service. This determination by the committee of conference was made in order not to delay further a final agreement on the remaining differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment.

"In addition, the committee of conference emphasizes that, in accordance with the declaration of policy contained in section 103 (c) (3) (B) of the conference substitute, neither the elimination by section 104 (a) (2) of the conference substitute of the reference to rural free delivery nor any other provision of the conference substitute has the effect of authorizing or requiring the elimination, consolidation, or discontinuance of any rural route, any star route, or any third-class or fourth-class post office. The committee of conference emphasizes further that it is not intended to preclude the making of appropriations for any such route or post office on either a public service or postal expense basis.

"Third, section 104 (a) of the conference substitute eliminates paragraphs (5), (6), and (8) of section 104 (a) of the Senate amendment, discussed above in connection with section 104 (a) of the Senate amendment.

"Appropriations for public services

"House bill: Section 204 of the House bill authorized appropriations to postal revenues each fiscal year in an amount equal to the sum of the public service items of the postal service, which items were not specifically identified in the House bill.

"Senate amendment: Subsection (b) of section 104 of the Senate amendment authorized appropriations to postal revenues each fiscal year of an amount equal to the total estimated expenditures of the Post Office Department for such fiscal year for the public service items specifically identified in subsection (a) of section 104 of the Senate amendment. Such expenditures were to be determined by the Congress in the particular appropriation Act based on budget estimates submitted to the Congress. These appropriations were to be paid into postal revenues to reimburse the Post Office Department for the cost of such public service items.

"Conference substitute: Subsection (b) of section 104 of the conference substitute is the same as subsection (b) of section 104 of the Senate amendment.

"5. Elimination of Reference to Cost Ascertainment System

"House bill: Section 205 of the House bill in effect reaffirmed and required the utilization of the cost ascertainment system of the Post Office Department as the basis for the determination of revenues and expenses and the making of allocations and apportionments with respect to revenues and expenses, in connection with the operation of the postal rate policy provisions.

"Subsection (a) of such section 205 provided that, for the purposes of title II of the House bill, revenues, and expenses shall be determined and ascertained, and each allocation and apportionment with respect thereto shall be made, upon the basis of the cost ascertainment system of the Post Office Department, to the extent not otherwise indicated in title II.

"Subsection (b) of such section 205 contained a savings provision to the effect that nothing contained in title II of the House bill shall be construed to affect the cost ascertainment system or any authority, power, duty, or procedure of the Postmaster General or of the postal establishment generally, except to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of title II.

"Senate amendment: The Senate amendment contained no provision similar to section 205 of the House bill reaffirming the cost ascertainment system of the Post Office Department as the basis for the determination of revenues and expenses and the making of allocations and apportionments with respect thereto.

"Conference substitute: The conference substitute, like the Senate amendment, contains no provision similar to section 205 of the House bill with respect to the cost ascertainment system.

"6. Reports of Postmaster General

"Section 206 of the House bill and section 105 of the Senate amendment contained comparable but not identical provisions requiring the Postmaster General to initiate and conduct reviews, studies, and surveys with respect to the need for the adjustment of postal rates and fees, in accordance with the respective postal rate policy provisions of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and to submit reports of the results of the reviews, studies, and surveys to the Senate and House of Representatives.

"House bill: Subsection (a) of section 206 of the House bill required the Postmaster General to initiate and conduct (from time to time or on a continuing basis, as he may determine, but at least every two years) a review of the postal-rate structure and a study and survey of the revenues received and expenses incurred in connection with the several classes of mail and the various classes and kinds of services and facilities provided by the postal establishment. The purpose of the review, study, and survey, which were required to be conducted through the facilities of the postal establishment, was to determine the need for adjustment of postal rates and fees in accordance with the postal-rate policy provisions of the House bill.

"Subsection (b) of such section 206 required that the Postmaster General submit to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than April 15 of each alternate fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, a report of the results of each such review, study, and survey. It was also required that such report include—

"(A) such information with respect to expenses and revenues as is pertinent to the allocation of expenses and the determination and adjustment of postal rates and fees in accordance with the postal-rate policy provisions of the House bill,

"(B) other information required by the Congress, or by an appropriate committee of the Congress, to carry out the postal-rate policy provisions of the House bill, and

"(C) such recommendations as the Postmaster General may deem appropriate.

"Senate amendment: Subsections (a) and (b) of section 105 of the Senate amendment contained provisions which are the same as the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 206 of the House bill, except for the following differences:

"First, the Senate amendment required that the report of the Postmaster General be submitted not later than April 15 of each alternate fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, in lieu of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, as provided by the House bill.

"Second, the Senate amendment omits specific reference to the inclusion in the report of recommendations of the Postmaster General while the House bill provides specifically for the inclusion in such report of those recommendations which the Postmaster General deems appropriate.

"Conference substitute: Section 105 of the conference substitute is the same as section 105 of the Senate amendment. However, the elimination from this provision of the conference substitute of specific reference to recommendations is not intended to preclude the Postmaster General from including in his report such recommendations as he deems appropriate.

"7. Congressional Action Prerequisite to Adjustments in Postage Rates and Fees

"House bill: Section 207 of the House bill provided that, except as otherwise provided by law, nothing contained in title II of the House bill shall be construed to authorize any change, adjustment, or revision with respect to any postal rate or fee, except by further action of the Congress.

"In effect, section 207 of the House bill reemphasized the exclusive authority of the Congress to establish and adjust postal rates.

"Senate amendment: The Senate amendment contained no specific provision comparable to section 207 of the House bill.

"Conference substitute: The conference substitute does not contain any provision similar to section 207 of the House bill.

"However, the elimination of such provision from the conference substitute is not intended to create any inference that the Congress is abdicating its exclusive authority to establish and adjust postal rates and fees in accordance with law.

"8. Elimination of Definitions

"House bill: Subsection (a) of section 208 of the House bill defined the terms 'cost ascertainment system', 'revenues', 'costs', and 'adjusted revenues' for the purposes of the postal rate policy provisions of the House bill.

"Paragraph (1) of such subsection (a) defined 'cost ascertainment system' as the cost ascertainment system (including the principles and standards thereof) utilized by the Post Office Department for the ascertainment and allocation of expenses and revenues of the postal service, as in effect from time to time, to the extent consistent with the postal rate policy provisions of the House bill.

"Paragraph (2) of such subsection (a) ascribed to the two terms 'revenues' and 'costs' the same meaning as when used in the Cost Ascertainment Report of the Post Office Department, whether applied to the total postal operation or to the respective mail classes and services. Also, the terms 'cost' and 'expenses' were declared to be synonymous.

"Paragraph (3) of such subsection (a) defined 'adjusted revenues', whether applied to the total postal operation or to the respective mail classes and services, as the revenues increased by sums authorized to be appropriated under title II of the House bill to the Post Office Department for public service items.

"Subsection (b) of section 208 of the House bill provided that any reference contained in title II of the House bill or in any law or regulation in connection with such title II to any of the several classes of mail and services shall have the same meaning as when used the Cost Ascertainment Report of the Post Office Department, except that first-class mail shall include domestic airmail other than air parcel post.

"Senate amendment: The Senate amendment contained no provisions which defined terms used in the postal policy provisions of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: The conference substitute, like the Senate amendment, contains no definitions for postal policy purposes.

"9. No Requirement of Downward Adjustment in Existing Fourth-Class Mail Rates

"Section 106 of the conference substitute provides that the provisions of title II of the conference substitute shall not require any downward adjustment in the rates of postage on fourth-class mail existing on the date of enactment of the conference substitute.

"Section 106 of the conference substitute is not intended to create any inference that a downward adjustment may not be made in the future in the rates of postage on fourth-class mail.

"Postal modernization fund

"Senate amendment: Section 301 of the Senate amendment established a trust fund in the Treasury of the United States, to be known as the Postal Modernization Fund.

"Section 302 of the Senate amendment provided that there shall be paid into the fund out of the receipts of postage on first-class mail the sum of $175,000,000 for three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and ending with the fiscal year June 30, 1961.

"Section 303 of the Senate amendment provided that the moneys in the fund, including interest on investments, would be available until expended, subject to appropriation by the Congress, for obligation by the Postmaster General for conducting research (directly or through private organizations) and for developing, acquiring, and placing into operation improved equipment and facilities for the performance of the postal function.

"Section 304 of the Senate amendment related to the management of the fund.

"Subsection (a) of such section imposed upon the Secretary of the Treasury the duty of holding the fund and of reporting annually to the Congress on its condition.

"Subsection (b) of such section imposed upon the Secretary of the Treasury the duty of investing such portion of the fund as was not, in his judgment and after consultation with the Postmaster General, required to meet current withdrawals. The invest-

ments authorized were interest bearing obligations of the United States or obligations guaranteed by the United States as to both principal and interest.

"Section 305 of the Senate amendment required the Postmaster General to include in his annual report to the President a detailed report with respect to the Postal Modernization Fund and activities relating thereto.

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions relating to a Postal Modernization Fund.

"Conference substitute: Title III of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment except that the conference agreement eliminates the provisions under which specified amounts of the proceeds of postage on first-class mail would be paid into the Fund, and instead authorizes the appropriation to the Fund, for each of the next three fiscal years, of such amounts as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes for which the Fund is established.

"Increases in compensation of postal employees

"Title IV of the Senate amendment provided for increases in the rates of basic salary of postal field service employees and set forth the operation, coverage, and effective dates of such increases. Title IV also proposed to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (Public Law 68, Eighty-fourth Congress; 39 U. S. C. 951–1038), by striking out the existing Postal Field Service Schedule, Rural Carrier Schedule, and Fourth-Class Office Schedule and inserting corresponding new schedules which provided generally higher rates of basic salary.

"These new schedules also provided additional salary rates identified by the term 'temporary rate' in all levels of the Rural Carrier Schedule and the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, and in the first seven levels of the Postal Field Service Schedule. The Senate amendment provided that the temporary rate would be in effect, in lieu of the regular scheduled rate, for the period beginning on the effective date of the Senate amendment and ending three years after such effective date.

"The House bill contained no provisions for adjusting the basic salaries of postal field service employees.

"1. Postal Field Service Schedule

"Basic salary is paid in accordance with the Postal Field Service Schedule to all employees in the postal field service except postmasters in post offices of the fourth class and carriers in the rural delivery service. The Postal Field Service Schedule has 20 salary levels. Each of the first 18 levels has seven step rates. Level 19 has 5 step rates. Level 20 has a single rate.

"Senate amendment: Section 401 (a) of the Senate amendment provided for a permanent increase in compensation for all employees under the Postal Field Service Schedule (except those employees in salary level PFS–20) plus a temporary (three-year) cost of living adjustment for employees in the first seven salary levels of the Postal Field Service Schedule.

"The permanent increase would have amounted to an upward adjustment of 7.5 percent in the existing rates of basic salary at the entrance step of all salary levels (except salary level PFS–20) of the Postal Field Service Schedule and an upward adjustment of 7.5 percent at the maximum step of the first fourteen salary levels. The amounts of the step increments in each salary level through salary level PFS–14 would have been increased consistently with the permanent increase of 7.5 percent in the rates of basic salary in those salary levels. There would have been no increase in the existing step increment of $300 in salary levels PFS–15 through PFS–19 and no increase of any kind in salary level PFS–20. The amount of permanent increase at the maximum steps in the higher salary levels would have been 6.2 percent at the maximum step of salary level PFS–15, 6.4 percent at the maximum steps of salary levels PFS–16 and PFS–17, 6.5 percent at the maximum step of salary level PFS–18, and 4.6 percent at the maximum step of salary level PFS–19. The number of steps in salary level PFS–19 would have been reduced from 5 steps to 4 steps. The maximum step of salary level PFS–19 would have been fixed at $100 per annum less than the per annum rate of $16,000 for salary level PFS–20.

"The temporary or three-year cost of living adjustment would have added $240 per annum to the new permanent rates of basic salary for employees in each of the first five salary levels, $160 per annum for employees in salary level PFS–6, and $80 per annum for employees in salary level PFS–7.

"In terms of percentage, the aggregate increase would have ranged from 15.8 percent in step 1 of salary level PFS–1 to 4.6 percent in the maximum step of salary level PFS–19, with no increase in salary level PFS–20.

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions similar to section 401 (a) of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Section 401 (a) of the conference substitute amends subsection 301 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 by striking out the Postal Field Service Schedule and inserting a new Postal Field Service Schedule which provides (1) the permanent rates of basic salary which were set forth in the Senate amendment, (2) temporary rates of basic salary in salary levels PFS–1 to PFS–6, inclusive, amounting to 2.5 percent above such permanent rates in such salary levels, and (3) temporary rates of basic salary in salary level PFS–7 amounting to 1.5 percent above such permanent rates in such salary level.

"The new Postal Field Service Schedule provides the following ranges of total increase:

"Level:	
1	$290–$380
2	315– 405
3	340– 430
4	375– 465
5	395– 485
6	430– 520
7	415– 475
8	365– 455
9	395– 485
10	435– 525
11	480– 570
12	525– 645
13	580– 700
14	640– 760
15	700– 700
16	775– 775
17	855– 855
18	960– 960
19	1,000– 700
20	0

"2. Rural Carrier Schedule

"Basic salary is paid to all carriers in the rural delivery service in accordance with the Rural Carrier Schedule. The Rural Carrier Schedule is based in part on fixed compensation per annum and in part on specified rates per mile per annum. The Rural Carrier Schedule contains seven steps.

"Senate amendment: Section 401 (b) of the Senate amendment provided for a permanent increase of approximately 7.5 percent for the rural carrier on a 42-mile route. This increase would have corresponded to the permanent increase for the city carrier with whom the rural carrier on the 42-mile route traditionally is alined.

"The Senate amendment would have granted a permanent increase of varying amounts other than the 7.5 percent for rural carriers on routes of other mileage because the proposed new Rural Carrier Schedule provided for an upward adjustment only in the fixed compensation per annum and without change in the existing specified rates per mile per annum.

"For example, the permanent increase would have been 14.1 percent at step 1 of the 6-mile route, 10.6 percent at step 1 of the 16-mile route, 8.6 percent at step 1 of the 25-mile route, 7.8 percent at step 1 of the 30-mile route, 6.6 percent at step 1 of the 60-mile route, 6.1 percent at step 1 of the 75-mile route, and 5.2 percent at step 1 of the 110-mile route.

"The temporary or three-year cost of living adjustment would have been provided with respect to all routes by adding $240 per annum to the permanent increase in each step. This method would have produced the following results with respect to the combined permanent and temporary percentage increase: a total increase of 13.6 percent at step 1 of the 42-mile route, 26.3 percent at step 1 of the 6-mile route, 19.8 percent at step 1 of the 16-mile route, 16.1 percent at step 1 of the 25-mile route, 14.6 percent at step 1 of the 30-mile route, 12.3 percent at step 1 of the 60-mile route, 11.4 percent at step 1 of the 75-mile route, and 9.8 percent at step 1 of the 110-mile route.

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions similar to section 401 (b) of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Section 401 (b) of the conference substitute amends subsection 302 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 by striking out the Rural Carrier Schedule and inserting a new Rural Carrier Schedule which provides (1) the permanent rates of basic salary which were set forth in the Senate amendment, and (2) temporary rates of "fixed compensation per annum" which exceed the existing rates of fixed compensation by the same amounts as the temporary rates in the corresponding steps of salary level PFS–4 in the Postal Field Service Schedule exceed the existing rates in such steps of such salary level.

"The resulting schedule, while producing a wide range of percentage increases throughout the Rural Carrier Schedule, provides a percentage increase in step 7 for the rural carrier on the 42-mile route which is equivalent to the percentage increase for a city carrier in step 7 of salary level PFS–4. This relationship reflects the traditional alignment between city letter carriers and rural carriers on the 42-mile route.

"3. Maximum Compensation for Rural Carriers on Heavy Duty Routes

"Section 302 (c) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 119; 39 U. S. C. 972 (c)) now provides that the Postmaster General may pay such additional compensation as he may determine to be fair and reasonable in each individual case to rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes not exceeding 61 miles in length, but that he may not pay additional compensation to a carrier serving such a route in an amount which would exceed $4,700, when added to the basic salary for the maximum step in the Rural Carrier Schedule for his route.

"Senate amendment: Subsection 401 (c) of the Senate amendment proposed to increase from $4,700 to $5,035 (and to $5,275 during the period for which the temporary cost-of-living adjustment would have been in effect) the maximum total compensation which may be paid to rural carriers who receive additional compensation for serving heavily patronized routes.

"In terms of permanent salary rates, the existing maximum compensation payable to such rural carriers would have been increased by 7.1 percent.

"In terms of temporary rates, the existing maximum compensation payable to such

rural carriers would have been increased by 12.2 percent.

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions similar to subsection 401 (c) of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Section 401 (c) of the conference substitute adopts the permanent rate contained in the Senate amendment and establishes a temporary rate which exceeds the existing $4,700 maximum combined compensation by $465, to correspond with the amount by which the temporary rate of fixed compensation for rural carriers in step 7 is increased over the existing rate of fixed compensation for such rural carriers.

"4. Fourth-Class Office Schedule

"Basic salary is paid in accordance with the Fourth-Class Office Schedule to all postmasters in post offices of the fourth class, based on the gross postal receipts as contained in returns of the post office for the calendar year immediately preceding. The Fourth-Class Office Schedule has 8 categories of gross receipts, with a range of 7 per annum rates and steps for each category.

"Senate amendment: Subsection 401 (d) of the Senate amendment provided for a permanent 7.5-percent increase in basic salary for all employees compensated under the Fourth-Class Office Schedule and a temporary or three-year cost of living adjustment of an additional 5 percent. The total increase provided for by such section 401 (d) would have been 12.5 percent above the existing rates in the Fourth-Class Office Schedule.

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions similar to section 401 (d) of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Section 401 (d) of the conference substitute amends subsection 303 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 by striking out the Fourth-Class Office Schedule and inserting a new Fourth-Class Office Schedule which (1) adopts the permanent rates of basic salary contained in the Senate amendment, with certain downward modifications to ensure uniform increases between steps in the various categories of gross receipts, and (2) provides temporary rates which incorporate additional increases averaging 2.5 percent above such permanent rates.

"5. Duration of Temporary Rates

"Senate amendment: Section 401 (e) of the Senate amendment proposed the addition of a new subsection (c) to section 304 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 121; 39 U. S. C. 974). The new subsection (c) provided that the temporary per annum rates, wherever provided by a basic salary schedule contained in title III of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, would be in effect, in lieu of the regular scheduled rate, for the period beginning on the effective date of the new subsection (c) and ending three years after such effective date.

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions similar to section 401 (e) of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Section 401 (e) of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Senate amendment, except that the conference substitute provides that the temporary period will end on the last day of the last pay period which begins not more than three years after the effective date of title IV of the conference substitute—that is, the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1958.

"6. Increases in the 'Saved Rates' of Certain Postal Field Service Employees

"Section 504 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 124; 39 U. S. C. 994) provided protection for certain postal field service employees against reduction of their former rates of compensation by reason of the operation of the new postal field service classification and salary system provided by such Act.

"For some postal field service employees, the operation of such section 504 has resulted in the retention of salary rates which exceed the respective maximum scheduled rates of the respective salary levels of the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, as the case may be, to which the positions of the employees concerned are allocated.

"Senate amendment: Section 402 (a) of the Senate amendment provided that the annual rate of basic salary of any officer or employee whose existing basic salary, by reason of section 504 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, is at a rate between two scheduled rates, or above the highest scheduled rate in the applicable schedule of rates, would be increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by title IV of the Senate amendment in the next lower rate in such schedule.

"Under such section 402 (a) an employee whose position is ranked in salary level PFS–6, but whose existing rate of basic salary is above the maximum scheduled rate of such salary level, would receive the same amount of increase as would be provided under the Senate amendment for the rate of step 7 of salary level PFS–6.

"Section 402 (b) of the Senate amendment ascribed to the term 'basic salary', as used in section 402, the same meaning as when used in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955. Such section 402 (b) in effect made applicable with respect to the provisions of section 402 (a) the definition of 'basic salary' contained in section 101 (7) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 89; 39 U. S. C. 951 (7)), which provided that 'basic salary' means the rate of annual or hourly compensation specified by law, exclusive of overtime, night differential, and longevity compensation.

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions similar to section 402 of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Section 402 (a) of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of section 402 (a) of the Senate amendment.

"7. Increases in Basic Salary Not 'Equivalent Increases'

"Senate amendment: Section 403 of the Senate amendment provided, in effect, that a basic salary increase under title IV of the Senate amendment shall not be considered to be an 'equivalent increase' in basic salary within the purview of section 401 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 122; 39 U. S. C. 981 (a)).

"Section 401 (a) of such Act (which relates to automatic advancement by step-increases for postal field service employees) provides that a step-increase may be granted only if no 'equivalent increase' in basic salary from any cause was received during the period of service on the basis of which such step-increase otherwise would be granted.

"By providing that the basic salary increases under title IV of the Senate amendment shall not be considered to be 'equivalent increases' within the meaning of section 401 (a), section 403 of the Senate amendment makes it clear that the receipt of the basic salary increases proposed by title IV of the Senate amendment would not have the effect of depriving any employee of any regular periodic step-increase to which he otherwise would be entitled under any provision of section 401.

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions similar to section 403 of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Section 403 of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of section 403 of the Senate amendment.

"8. Postal Employees of the Canal Zone Government

"Senate amendment: Section 404 of the Senate amendment proposed to authorize and direct the Governor of the Canal Zone to grant, retroactively effective as of January 1, 1958, to postal employees of the Canal Zone Government, increases in basic salary corresponding to the increases in basic salary provided by title IV of the Senate amendment for similar employees. Section 404 of the Senate amendment is in accordance with the policy contained in section 804 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 130; 39 U. S. C. 1034) which provides for the adoption of applicable provisions of such Act for postal employees of the Canal Zone Government.

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions similar to section 404 of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Section 404 of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of section 404 of the Senate amendment.

"9. Applicability to Guam

"Senate amendment: Section 405 of the Senate amendment specifically provided that title IV of the Senate amendment (provisions relating to increases in basic salary for postal field service employees) shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions similar to section 405 of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Section 405 of the conference substitute is the same as section 405 of the Senate amendment, except that section 405 of the conference substitute is made applicable to all of the provisions of the conference substitute.

"Section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 391; Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress) provides that—

" 'No law of the United States hereafter enacted shall have any force or effect within Guam unless specifically made applicable by Act of the Congress either by reference to Guam by name or by reference to "possessions." '

"Section 405 of the conference substitute is intended to remove any inference that all of the provisions of the conference substitute do not apply to Guam by providing specifically that the conference substitute will have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

"10. Classes of Individuals Entitled to Payment of Retroactive Compensation or Salary Increase

"Senate amendment: Section 406 of the Senate amendment provided that, except for postal field service employees who died or retired during the retroactive period, the payment of retroactive salary or compensation by reason of title IV of the Senate amendment would be made only in the case of individuals in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the dateof enactment of title IV. Retroactive payment also would be made, for services rendered during the retroactive period, in the case of postal field service employees who retired or died during such period. For the purposes of section 406, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, would include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions similar to section 406 of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Section 406 of the conference substitute, the operation and effect of which is discussed below is the same as section 406 of the Senate amendment.

"Section 406 of the conference substitute delineates the classes of individuals entitled to receive payment of the amount of any increase in salary or compensation which is payable, under authority of title 406 of the conference substitute, with respect to a postal field service employee within the purview of such title, for any retroactive period of service of such employee which is covered by such title.

Subsection (a) (of section 406 of the conference substitute provides, in effect, that the amount of any increase in the rate of compensation or salary of any individual resulting from the enactment of title IV of the conference substitute for any period, beginning on and after the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1958, and ending on or before the date of enactment of such title IV, during which period such individual was on the rolls in the postal field service (excluding time on such rolls with respect to which no compensation in salary was payable), shall be paid, as follows:

"(1) to such individual, if, on such date of enactment (A) he is on the rolls as an employee in the postal field service or on any other employment roll of the Federal Government or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, (B) is in the service of the Armed Forces of the United States, or (C) is retired under the Government civilian retirement system to which he is subject, or

"(2) to the survivor or survivors, in accordance with the order of precedence and other provisions contained in the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress), as amended (5 U. S. C. 61f–61k), relating to the settlement of accounts of deceased Government officers and employees, of any such individual who has died prior to such date of enactment, if, at the time of his death, such individual was (A) on the rolls as an employee in the postal field service or on any other employment roll of the Federal Government or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, (B) in the service of the Armed Forces of the United States, or (C) retired under such retirement system.

"The order of precedence for payment to survivors under the Act of August 3, 1950, is as follows: first, the beneficiary or beneficiaries appropriately designated by the deceased officer or employee; second, the widow or widower of such officer or employee; third, the child or children of such officer or employee and descendants of deceased children by representation; fourth, the parent or parents of such officer or employee; and fifth, the legal representative of the estate of such officer or employee or, if none, to the person or persons determined to be entitled thereto under the laws of the domicile of the officer or employee.

"Subsection (a) of section 406 of the conference substitute expressly provides for payment of the increase in compensation or salary for the retroactive period to the survivor or survivors of a deceased individual only in the case in which such individual dies prior to the date of enactment of title IV of the conference substitute. If the individual dies on or after such date of enactment, his right to receive payment of such increase would have vested in him during his lifetime under that part of such subsection (a) which provides for payment to an individual on the employment rolls on such date. Consequently, the survivor or survivors of such individual would be entitled to receive payment of the unpaid amount of such increase as an item of the employment account of such individual to be settled under the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950, in the same manner as in the case of the application of such Act with respect to the settlement of accounts of deceased Government officers and employees generally.

"Section 406 (a) of the conference substitute also provides that such retroactive compensation or salary shall not be considered as basic salary for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act in the case of any such retired or deceased postmaster, officer, or employee.

"Subsection (b) of section 406 of the conference substitute provides that, in the case of an individual who is relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or who is discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia also shall be deemed to be service in the Armed Forces of the United States for purposes of such section. This mandatory restoration period of 90 days in the case of relief from such training and service and 90 days after relief from not more than one year of such hospitalization is established by section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 App. U. S. C. 459).

"11. Effective Dates for Salary Increase Provisions

"Senate amendment: Section 407 of the Senate amendment provided the effective dates for the salary increase provisions of title IV of the conference substitute.

"Section 407 (a) provided that title IV would become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1958.

"Section 407 (b) provided that, for the purposes of determining the amount of insurance for which an officer or employee is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (5 U. S. C. 2091–2103), all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of title IV shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of title IV.

"House bill: The House bill contained no provisions similar to section 407 of the Senate amendment.

"Conference substitute: Section 407 of the conference substitute adopts the provisions of section 407 of the Senate amendment.

"It may be noted that subsection (b) of section 407 of the conference substitute establishes the date of enactment of title IV of the conference substitute as the date on which the changes in rates of compensation or salary made by such title will become effective for the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an employee (whose compensation or salary is so changed) is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (5 U. S. C. 2091–2103).

"The Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 provides for the granting of life and accident insurance to a Government employee in an amount approximating his annual compensation or salary. Title IV of the conference substitute provides salary or compensation increases to postal field service employees for a past or retroactive period as well as for periods in the future. As a result of these increases, some postal field service employees will become eligible for greater amounts of insurance under such Act.

"Subsection (b) of section 407 of the conference substitute is necessary, however, in order to avoid certain problems which might result from the application of such increases for past or retroactive periods.

"Examples of these problems are as follows:

"(1) the liability of the employee to pay premiums for insurance based on the increased annual compensation or salary for the past or retroactive period;

"(2) the amount of insurance to which a deceased employee who died during the retroactive period was entitled at the time of his death; and

"(3) the amount of insurance to which an employee who retired during the retroactive period was entitled at the time of his retirement.

"In order to avoid problems of this nature, subsection (b) of section 407 of the conference substitute provides that the salary or compensation increases will become effective on the date of enactment, for purposes of determining the amount of insurance of an employee under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.

"Title

"With respect to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the House bill, the committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same. Such title of the conference substitute is as follows: 'An Act to establish a postal policy, to adjust postal rates, to adjust the compensation of postal employees, and for other purposes'."

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the rate provisions of this bill are the finest that have ever been presented to the House. I believe that the benefits of the increased revenues which is very much needed by the Post Office Department far outweigh some of the features of this bill which, in my opinion, could be improved.

In August last year the House of Representatives approved legislation which increased postal rates in every category of mail except parcel post, which rates are fixed administratively. This legislation was subsequently amended in the Senate to include a 5-cent postage rate for nonlocal first-class letter mail, and an 8-cent rate for airmail, as well as other changes in the rate schedules. In addition, the Senate added a provision for increasing the salary of postal employees by 7½ percent on a permanent basis and a cost-of-living increase of $240 through level 5, $160 at level 6, and $80 at level 7. The salary increases were to be effective the first pay period after January 1, 1958.

After extensive conferences, the conferees have come to an agreement. This legislation is probably not completely satisfactory to anyone, but is generally conceded to be the best legislation that can be arrived at in a bill that is so complicated and which has such a wide impact upon business and individuals.

In general, with respect to the postal-rate increases, it can be said the rate increases are nearly the same as those approved by our committee in the 83d Congress and the House in both the 84th and this Congress.

Under this bill, first-class mail rates will go to 4 cents and drop letters, post, and postal cards to 3 cents. The airmail rate will go to 7 cents and airmail postcards to 5 cents.

Schedules of increases in second-class mail are not quite as high as those in the House-passed bill. For example, on the reading matter, the increases amount to approximately 30 percent, and on the advertising portion 54 percent, both increases spread in 3 increments a year apart.

The increases in third-class mail are pretty much the same as passed the House, except there is an interim increase from 1½ to 2 cents on the minimum piece rate for bulk mailings, and then a later increase to 2½ cents. These increases in the bulk minimum rate would be to 2 cents January 1, 1959, and to 2½ cents on July 1, 1960.

Books, under the provision of the bill as it passed the House, would have been raised to 10 cents on the first pound and 5 cents on each additional pound. There was no increase for books in the Senate bill. Under the Conference Agreement, the rate on books will be 9 cents on the first pound and 5 cents on each additional pound, and these rates are extended to certain additional material. There is no change in library book rates.

Probably the best way to show the differences in the effect of the provisions of the House and Senate bills and the Conference Agreement is to compare total revenue raised. The total increased revenue based on present volume under the House bill would be $550 million, under the Senate bill $730.2 million, and under the Conference Agreement $550 million.

The main change in the Conference Agreement is the adjustment in the effective dates. The effective date for most rate increases is August 1. The effective date for the first increase in second and third-class bulk mailing is January 1. As has been indicated previously, the main reason for obtaining a rule on this Conference Agreement before the House is because of the passage of time. It was necessary to advance the effective dates of all of the rate increases, having in mind the impact upon individuals and on business.

The Conference Agreement retains the authorization for a Postal Modernization Fund. As originally approved by the Senate, it contemplated that the revenues from the 5-cent nonlocal-mail rate, estimated at $175 million a year, be paid into this fund. Since the 5-cent nonlocal rate increase is not included in the Conference Agreement, the amount of the fund was struck out. The provision for the fund, however, remains with the thought that if the Appropriations Committee desires to provide such a program, the authorization for the fund will be there.

There are certain features of the postal policy provisions which will raise very serious questions in the future when it comes to appropriations called for public service. It will be something that the Appropriations Committee will want to look very carefully at when it comes to making appropriations for the total loss of certain services as compared to our position on the loss of revenue. Also, it will be inappropriate, in my opinion, to provide a subsidy for the delivery of mail to individuals or star routes or fourth-class post offices when millions of others on rural routes and in cities receive their mail delivered without any indication that it is subsidized delivery. I believe the time will come when we will have to take care of the inconsistencies in the policies and prepare to support such revisions in line with the position of our committee and the House when this bill was before them last year.

With respect to the pay legislation, the conference agreement provides a 7½ percent permanent increase for all postal employees in the postal-field service, except level 20. Level 20 presently has a ceiling of $16,000 and that ceiling is retained. There is a temporary cost of living increase of 2½ percent for 3 years for the employees in level 6 and below. A 1½ percent for those in level 7 but above level 7 there is no temporary increase provided. We were not able to extend this temporary increase to all levels because of the restrictions on the extent to which the conferees could go. There seems to be general agreement that consideration would and should be given to equalizing the salary adjustments and very likely recommendations with respect to that will be made by the Postmaster General. All of these increases are effective retroactively to January 1, 1958.

Many will agree, I am sure, that a January 1 retroactive date making retroactive salary increases earlier by nearly a half year is stretching the retroactive payment too far. I am strongly opposed to it, and so stated to the conferees. It will require a supplemental appropriation in the neighborhood of $115 million. Also, there are many who will agree with me that the 2½ percent temporary cost of living increase throws the salary increases completely out of line with the increase we have provided for the military or might possibly provide for those paid under the Classification Act schedule. It is wrong because it is over and above the increased cost of living since the last pay bill in 1955 and because it distorts the pay schedules as it does not go above level 7. The annual increased payroll cost as a result of the postal salary increase is $265 million. On the other hand, weighing the excellent postal rate increase bill providing for the increased revenue of over a half billion dollars against some of the less desirable features of the salary increase bill, it should be clear to everyone this is the best bill we could work out in such a controversial, complicated, and technical field.

I urge the Members to approve this conference agreement. There probably has been no piece of legislation that has had more lengthy consideration by the Congress than postal rates and salaries. Virtually this same rate bill was passed by the committee in the 83d Congress and the House in the 84th Congress. Again, in the first session of this Congress salary increases already have been vetoed. If this legislation is approved by the House, as it already has been approved by the other body, and it becomes law, then this very controversial and complicated problem will be solved for some time to come.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there is little further I can add to what the chairman has said with respect to this legislation except to say that the conferees spent a great deal of time in their efforts to bring about a satisfactory report. Of course, it is a compromise. This is the best report that can be secured. All the conferees have signed the report. The legislation has been approved without objection in the other body. There is nothing further that I can add except to join with my chairman in recommending the approval of this report.

Following action by the conferees on these salary increases, I stated that if the Congress approved this legislation I would recommend final approval. I have had the opportunity to discuss this legislation personally with the President and, while not presuming to predict what action he will take, I have been greatly encouraged at the prospect of obtaining final approval.

My efforts to obtain equitable salary increases for postal employees have been based on information and evidence developed both personally and through our committee deliberations which bear directly on the postal salary problem. I have pointed out these factors to Administration officials.

I repeat, I strongly concur in the statement of our committee chairman that this is the best and the most equitable legislation that we could work out in this complex and controversial area of postal activity. The agreement was reached after one of the longest and most thorough conferences in my recollection. Every provision of the agreement has received the most careful consideration. The agreement on postal rates is very close to the rate provisions passed by this House in both the 84th Congress and in the first session of this Congress. House approval of the agreement will provide an effective solution to major postal problems for some time to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the motion to approve the report.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. In the judgment of the gentleman from Kansas, after the experience the gentleman has had here for the last 6 weeks, would you advise in the future any tieup between rate and pay bills?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No, sir; I would not advise it in the future.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, although some may quibble over specifics of provisions agreed upon by the conference committee, their overall objectives are sound. The conference report should receive overwhelming approval.

No one who has studied this matter can deny that our postal workers deserve a raise. Their salaries simply have not kept pace with the rising cost of living. That fact has been amply and ably demonstrated to me by employee groups in my District.

Let us never forget that the postal service is one of the few utterly necessary services in our national life. Through thick and thin, these people carry out their essential work. In return, they have every right to expect that Uncle Sam will provide them with an adequate living wage.

But any pay raise for postal workers, badly needed as it is, must be accompanied by increased income to help pay for such salaries. In the past, Congress has not always recognized this responsibility. All too often postal pay has been upped, but not postal rates.

Today the zero hour has come. If we are to maintain fiscal responsibility, rates must be increased on certain classes of mail in order to help pay the cost of providing postal workers with a decent wage.

There should be no blinking from the facts of life involved here. It is estimated that the Post Office Department loses about $2 million a day, or some $700 million a year, with its present revenues and wage scale. That would build 17 nuclear-powered submarines or 87 B–52 jet bombers or 700 IRBM guided missiles. Although perhaps it would be too much to expect this Department to be completely self-supporting, that deficit is clearly too large.

Thus, the crying need for an increase in rates is made doubly imperative by the pressing need for pay boosts. Neither can be denied. Both are badly needed.

Both are adequately and soundly provided for in this conference report. Although I have misgivings about some aspects of it, I believe it is a strong and sane step in the right direction. This is not a perfect bill, but because it provides substantial justice for our many fine postal workers and because it recognizes the need to offset pay raises with rate increases I shall support the conference committee's report. Only by accepting this report can we see to it that our postal employees get the salary increases they so richly deserve.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H. R. 5836, the postal pay increase and postal rate adjustment bill. The pay increases for postal employees provided by this bill are already long overdue.

Postal employees have received no increase in pay for 3 years, whereas pay rates in industry have continued to increase during this period, particularly in the San Francisco Bay area of California. As an illustration, blue collar wage board civil service employees whose wages under law are readjusted periodically to correspond with comparable wages paid in industry, have received three pay increases during the last 3 years in the San Francisco Bay area, whereas postal employees and classified civil service employees have received none. The postal pay increases in this bill are urgently needed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, there are several features in this report with which I cannot agree.

One of them has been discussed by the chairman, the policy statement in the report. I think the policy outlined is based upon a false premise. I trust that if this conference report is adopted, at some future time we shall have an opportunity to correct the policy as prescribed in this bill. I think it establishes wrong values for the determination of certain public service items set forth in the bill, and therefore it should be corrected.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I assume the gentleman refers to the rate base?

Mr. GARY. I do.

Mr. CANFIELD. I agree heartily with the statement the gentleman has just made. It is an error, and unfortunately so.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Then, I call your attention to the fact that we provided in the appropriation bill some years ago, in order to carry out the provisions of the parcel post law, that the Postmaster General shall, when parcel post income is not sufficient to pay the cost of that service, increase the rates on fourth-class matter to make it self-supporting. The original parcel post law contained a provision requiring the Postmaster General to fix rates, subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, so that parcel post would be self-sustaining. In my opinion that was put into the law for a purpose, because parcel post is the only branch of the postal service which comes in competition with private enterprise, and the Congress did not want that competition to be unfair.

At the request of the Post Office Department the House wrote into this bill a leeway of 1 percent variation between receipts and expenses before the rates would have to be changed. The other body increased that to 8 percent. Frankly, I think there is some reason for a slight leeway but the conferees finally agreed on 4 percent, which in my judgment is too high. A leeway of 2 or 3 percent is certainly ample.

Then, finally, with respect to the postal modernization fund, we have this situation. The bill as it passed the House fixed the rate of first-class mail at 4 cents per ounce; the Senate committee increased the rate on out-of-town mail to 5 cents per ounce. It was estimated that the extra cent would yield approximately $175 million. A provision was inserted in the bill that the $175 million be set aside as a special fund for the modernization of post offices.

I hope I am not developing a complex, but, as all of you know, I have been fighting every special fund that has come before this body. The reason for that is that the special fund takes away from the Congress the authority to appropriate the money in these special funds, and leaves it to the heads of the departments to spend the money as they see fit. A provision was then written into the bill to reserve to the Congress the right to appropriate the money for the special fund. Then the 5-cent rate was stricken from the bill, as the result of which the $175 million will not be realized. Nevertheless, the language with respect to the establishment of the special fund was left in the bill. I assume that under those circumstances this postal modernization fund provision is a nullity, and I would like to have the view of the chairman of the committee on that point.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I agree with the gentleman entirely, that unless the Congress makes the appropriation it has no force and effect.

Mr. GARY. This provision has no force and effect unless the Congress makes an appropriation?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is certainly correct.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman. It was my desire to clarify this situation for the record.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman does not have any so-called complex with respect to this matter. As usual he has given this legislation his careful study.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

I am not going to oppose the conference report but I hope these defects can be corrected later.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I agree entirely with the gentleman's timely observations about the postal policy provisions in title I of the conference report. It should be changed.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and to express the hope that it will be overwhelmingly adopted by the House. I say that because I believe it is the best conference report we can get. As I stated in an exchange with the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] a week or so ago, I think it is time we stopped playing politics with this thing, that we started putting something in the postal workers' pockets.

There are, however, certain places where I feel this conference report fails, and I will endeavor to point them out.

First, the 7½ percent increase with a 2½ percent cost of living increase is a fair amount. However, the supervisors are treated differently. They are given only a 1½ percent cost of living increase. I venture to say that this will be the only salary bill to come before Congress in which this discrimination will take place. In the classified bill the increase will be a straight percentage across the

board. The military pay bill made no such discrimination. I think the Congress should in the near future attempt to correct this inequity.

Second, as far as rates are concerned the Members of this body will some day learn not to put rate bills and salary bills together, because I believe it gives an opportunity to those who are opposed to postal rate increases an opportunity to delay their enactment and they would like to have delayed it further than this with the result that the postal worker is the one who would suffer.

What happened with this rate bill? We put the first-class rate into effect on the first of August of this year, but the increase in second-class rates do not go into effect until January of 1959, and the new third-class mail rate, the first increment goes into effect not until January of 1959, and the second increase from 2 to 2½ cents will not become effective until July 1, 1960.

I think that is unforgivable, and as far as I am concerned, if it had not been for the fact that the postal workers would suffer I would have been in favor of sending this conference report back where it belong to correct these effective dates as far as these classes of mail are concerned. It just seems to me that we have been lobbied too much by people who are interested in second- and third-class mail. I am not opposed to second- and third-class mail; I think third-class mail, the kind known as junk mail, does serve a purpose in our economy, but they should at least have the same effective dates as these raises that we are putting into effect on first-class mail on August 1.

I hope this conference report will be adopted, I hope it will be overwhelmingly approved, but I think also that at a later date we ought to have the gumption to come in here and do something about advancing the effective date of there rate changes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today's action by our august body is action which I have consistently favored since I came to Congress. In my opinion, the passage of legislation authorizing a 10 percent increase for postal workers is long over due.

In a district like mine, the Third District of Illinois, located in Chicago, I have a great many postal workers and have had first hand opportunity to observe them at work. I know about the high cost of living today and they not only deserve a pay increase but they need it to meet the necessities of life. Meeting the needs and demands of a family in the 20th century is not as easy as it used to be.

Morale is a salient factor in any organization whether it be Government or private enterprise. Factors contributing to low morale should be corrected. I believe that the legislation we have at long last acted upon today will be a step toward better service. None of us deny what a pat on the back or a boost in salary does to people. It certainly generates new interest in our job.

The postal employees in my District are familiar, I believe, with my open support since I have been in Washington. Last session I introduced a bill providing an increase for postal employees in cities like Chicago. I do not pretend to be an authority in postal matters but I did know that we had to have a starting point. Few will disagree with me that it costs more to pay the rent and buy the food in a metropolitan city like Chicago than it does in a small town.

I repeat that it is a rewarding feeling to know that I have contributed to making the salary increase possible for our many, many thousands of loyal postal employees throughout the Nation, and in particular, those employees in my District. The retroactive feature of the bill passed today is merited.

My congratulations to all those who will benefit from the legislation passed today. I am mindful of the postal rate increase problem but it is not my conviction that the committee members or anyone else should continue to quibble over this matter. Action on pay increases for our postal workers deserved priority consideration. They have been a patient group of employees.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on every occasion since I have been a Member of this body I have fought and voted for pay increases for the humble workers in the Federal service. Those in the high brackets seem to experience no difficulty in getting salary boosts, and I have yet to hear of a Presidential veto in such cases. But to get something for the humble Federal workers is another story. It has been a long, hard fight over a road hurdled with White House opposition and vetoes to get the tiniest of consideration for the underpaid postal workers. I am voting for the conference report, not that I think the pay increase is anywhere near adequate, but because I know if the report is not adopted the matter will end there and the postal workers again will come away only with a zero.

As to the 4-cent stamp, it is bad enough, considering that first-class mail at 3 cents pays its way, but it is a lot less piratical than a 5-cent stamp. In a compromise I suppose everyone has to make concessions. I cannot be stopped from thinking, however, that the new 4-cent stamp should bear the picture of a pirate's flag.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in complete accord with the statement previously made by my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG]. I have in the past strenuously opposed, and am still opposed, to the raising of the first-class mail rate and of the postal card rate. I regret exceedingly there will be some, unfortunately, who will try to blame the increase in rates on the postal employees. The postal employees should be completely exonerated.

I shall, of course, vote for the conference report, for I feel that the postal pay increases have priority. I shall hope, although I do not have much confidence, that the suggestion of my colleague from Michigan that the other increases in postal rates should be made uniform as to the time of their effectiveness will be acted upon.

In the meantime, I also wish to state that I strongly urge the passage of the classified pay increase at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill which the conferees have hammered out after many weeks of deliberation.

A hybrid was produced. There are many features which are good and many are bad. In my opinion, the good outweighs the bad, and in view of the fact that if we do not accept this bill now the harassed postal employees will receive no aid for several years.

I for one favored a $546 increase across the board for all postal employees. My bill would have approximated 12½ increase. This conference bill provides for a 10 percent increase for the employees in the first six levels, 2½ percent of which is considered as a cost of living bonus, and 9 percent increase for those in level seven, 1½ percent of which is considered as cost of living bonus. These provisions are retroactive to January 1, 1958, as they should be. The increases under the conference bill range from $375 to $520. The cost of this program will approximate $265 million.

The provisions with respect to the rate increases are unfair. These are substantially set forth the way the House passed them. The unconscionable charge of 5 cents for a stamp for non-local mail in first-class deliveries was fortunately struck down. The second-class mail was increased to the extent of 30 percent in three stages, while magazines containing advertising matter were increased in three stages at rates of 18 percent. These rate increases shall take effect in January 1959. The burden of carrying the Post Office rests solely upon the users of first-class mail, which is unfair.

The increase in first-class mail will produce an additional $348 million; the increase in second-class mail will produce approximately $33 million; the increase in third-class mail will produce approximately $128 million. The anticipated additional revenue for all classes of mail will be approximately $527 million.

Statistics show that the first-class mail is self-supporting, but because of a specious theory of intangible factors, it is demonstrated that the first-class mail is losing money. Once again an administration has foisted the burden upon John Q. Public and favored business and industry.

Because of the overriding need of postal workers to obtain a decent wage to meet the rise in the cost of living, I must support this bill, although it contains postal-rate features which are obnoxious and unfair. I would happily favor this bill if all classes of mail became self-supporting and it did not burden the users of first-class mail.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have supported postal pay increase legislation from the very beginning and I support the conference report before us today. However, I am disappointed in the bill for the reason that the temporary increase does not apply to all postal workers. I do not believe we should discriminate against any group of postal employees, and I am hopeful that we can consider and pass legislation during this session of Congress to correct this inequity. I also believe that legislation should be enacted in order to make the second- and third-class mail rates more realistic by making the effective dates apply immediately instead of later as is now the case in the bill before us.

I repeat that I do strongly support the pay bill before us as it is long overdue. I also wish to commend the fine leaders of the various postal organizations who have worked so long in an effort to bring this legislation to a successful conclusion.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has a twofold purpose. It gives a needed increase in pay to the postal employees on the one hand, and, on the other, provides the source of revenue with which to pay it. Therefore, in view of the continued increase in the cost of living, I gladly support it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, like many others in this House, I deplore the fact that postal rates and postal pay must be considered in one bill. They are different matters entirely, and should stand on their own merits.

I do not believe that anyone can question the need for pay increases for our postal employees, and I am glad of the opportunity to vote for them.

On the other hand, while everyone concedes the need for postal rate adjustments between certain classes of mail, there is serious question as to justification of some of these rate increases.

It is regrettable that the parliamentary situation forces us to approve some rate increases which are questionable, in order to get a pay bill passed.

That, however, is our situation, and I earnestly hope we will not meet with it again in our treatment of these problems.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I expect to vote to accept the conference report on H. R. 5836. Across-the-board percentage increases are objectionable because they are too high in some parts of the country and not high enough in others, including New York City in which my District is situated. Nevertheless, I support this conference report as presented and hope the report will be adopted and the bill will be signed promptly by the President.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly support the conference report, urge its adoption by this House, and trust that it will promptly become law.

Of course there are provisions in this report which I wish were not there or which I wish were otherwise. But in its broad terms this conference report gives recognition—long overdue—to the fact that a pay increase and a rate increase are both in order.

In legislation of this type compromise is inevitable if there is to be any positive accomplishment. Any features of this conference report which involve a basic error in principle can be, and I have no doubt will be, corrected by subsequent legislation. The important fact is that there has at long last been accomplishment in the way of realistic recognition that rate and pay increases are both in order.

I recognize the drawbacks which have been involved in linking together the pay and rate legislation. I have never subscribed to the proposition that employees should be denied a justified pay increase because Congress would not meet its responsibility in providing increased postal revenues. At the same time, I am glad the two bills have been tied together insofar as this has involved finally a belated recognition of the obligation of Congress to offset the more than a quarter century increase in operating costs of the Post Office Department with a revenue increase. At last we raise the rates as well as the costs of the Department—which is a victory for honesty and consistency.

With all respect to my colleagues who differ, I do not share the great concern voiced by some over the retroactive feature of the pay bill. I supported a pay increase last year. I see no reason why the increase should not be retroactive unless it can be demonstrated that justification for the pay increase has developed since January 1 of this year which did not exist then—or even last year.

Of course politics has been played with this issue—and neither side of this House has had a monopoly on the politics. I see no reason why employees of the postal service—for whom we are all so sympathetic today—should be penalized because for political or other arbitrary reasons some were not so sympathetic a year ago.

The pay increase in this conference report is, in substance, identical with the proposal I offered in the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service earlier this year, and which was rejected by the committee. I am happy that this schedule, including the clear recognition that the hardships of inflated living costs are most severe on those in the lower income groups, has been incorporated in the legislation.

Again I express the hope that the House will overwhelmingly approve the conference report and that it will speedily become law.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary:

SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE REPORT—MAJOR POINTS

Postal pay: 7½ percent increase for all postal employees except level 20; temporary cost-of-living increase of 2½ percent for levels 1 through 6; 1½ percent for level 7; average increase of 10 percent; retroactive to January 1, 1958. Cost: (1) Annual, $265 million; (2) retroactive, $96 million (5 mo.).

Postal rates, revenue to be derived: Approximately $550 million when all rates are in effect.

First-class mail: Letters from 3 cents to 4 cents; airmail from 6 cents to 7 cents; postal and post cards from 2 cents to 3 cents; airmail post cards from 4 cents to 5 cents—effective August 1, 1958.

Second-class mail: Reading portion: Three 10-percent increases, first increase effective January 1, 1959.

Advertising portion: Three 18-percent increases, first increase effective January 1, 1959.

Minimum rate per piece: From one-eighth cent to one-fourth cent on January 1, 1959; to three-eighths cent on January 1, 1960; and to one-half cent on January 1, 1961. No increase on nonprofit, and so forth, organizations or for classroom use.

Controlled circulation: From 10 cents per pound for under 8 ounces and 11 cents per pound for over 8 ounces to a uniform 12 cents per pound, regardless of weight.

Third-class mail: Individual items—weighing less than 16 ounces—2 cents to 3 cents on first 2 ounces and 1 cent to 1½ cents on each additional ounce, effective January 1, 1959.

Books and catalogs: 2 cents to 3 cents on first 2 ounces and additional ounces; 1½ cents for each additional 2 ounces to 1½ cents for each additional ounce, effective January 1, 1959.

Bulk rates: Pound rate from 14 cents to 16 cents on circulars and merchandise, effective January 1, 1959; books and catalogs not increased. Minimum per piece rates from 1½ cents to 2 cents January 1, 1959, and to 2½ cents on July 1, 1960; bulk mailing fee increased from $10 to $20; odd sizes and shapes from 3 cents to 6 cents; no increase on nonprofit, and so forth, organizations until July 1, 1960, when the per piece minimum will be increased from 1 cent to 1¼ cents.

Books: Increased from 8 cents on the first pound and 4 cents on each additional pound to 9 cents on the first pound and 5 cents on each additional pound; extends rates to certain additional material. Continues existing library book rates and extends them to certain additional material.

Miscellaneous: 4-percent leeway before Postmaster General petitions ICC for increases in parcel post rates. Retirement contributions considered as a postal cost.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the motion to approve the conference report.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. A motion to recommit is not in order on this conference report, because the Senate has already acted. This takes away that right.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the conference report fails to establish the necessary basic principle in postal rate legislation contained in the House version of H. R. 5836.

I refer to section 104 (d) of the House bill which was adopted as an amendment on *August 13*, 1957, by a 171–147 teller vote—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 11, pages 14612–14614. The purpose of this amendment was simply to place a $100,000 limitation on the second-class postal subsidies for any single user of this type of mail.

For that reason I hoped to offer a motion to recommit with instructions to include this subsidy limitation in this bill. Under the present parliamentary situation this is not possible.

As I have pointed out on numerous occasions, the losses to the Post Office Department in handling second-class mail have amounted to more than $2.5 billion during the past 11 years. The subsidy to the 10 largest circulation magazines in 1 year alone totals more than $32 million. The modest increases in second-class mail rates provided in the conference report will not even begin to reduce the size of this subsidy to the big publishers. On the contrary, with ever-increasing circulation it will most likely result in an even greater deficit despite the 3 annual 10-percent rate increases. Moreover, the effective date of January 1, 1959, will provide an additional $12.5 million windfall for the publishers.

Mr. Speaker, a version of the subsidy-limitation amendment was also offered in the Senate on February 27, 1958, cosponsored by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. While the amendment was rejected 33 to 57 on a rollcall vote, I think that it should be pointed out Congress has made no clear-cut decision on the principle of second-class postal subsidy limitation. Adding together the House and Senate votes for and against the 2 subsidy-limitation amendments we see that 204 Members voted for the principle and exactly 204 Members voted against. One amendment was adopted, one was rejected. The conference committee has eliminated the amendment despite the evenly divided votes of those present and voting on the two occasions when it has been presented. In view of the action of the House conferees in dropping this section from the bill, I feel that the Members of the House should be given the opportunity to conclusively act on the principle of subsidy limitation.

During the past several months we have witnessed a propaganda campaign of gigantic proportions, carried on by the magazine publishers lobby against the subsidy-limitation amendment. They have filled the record with distortions and half-truths.

The fact is that the Post Office Department does not consider second-class publishers, subsidy-limitation administratively unworkable. On a nationwide television program the Postmaster General declared that this amendment is not impossible to administer.

The fact is that the subsidy-limitation amendment would not, as has been claimed, vest any life-or-death power over competing publications in the hands of the Postmaster General.

The fact is that subsidy limitation is not an attempt to penalize certain magazines with large circulation. It merely establishes a cutoff point to prevent the continued exorbitant losses to the Department in the handling of this type of mail.

The fact is that most magazine publishers can well afford to pay a fair share of the cost of handling the publications. Financial data which I placed in the RECORD last year shows that most of them are making record profits. Moreover, the additional postage costs resulting from such an amendment could easily be offset by slight increases in their subscription rates. Most publishers have raised their rates in the past 3 months in anticipation of increased second-class rates.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor the pay raises for postal workers contained in this bill. They are long overdue. I regret that postal rate and postal pay legislation have been combined because I feel that the two are not related. I want it clearly understood that my only objection to this conference report is based on the continued multimillion dollar subsidies to well-established, profit-making private publishing businesses, not because of the pay raises for postal workers contained in the bill.

I do not believe we should burden the American public with a 4-cent first-class rate unless some type of limitation is placed on these gigantic subsidy handouts to large magazine publishers. After adoption of my publishers subsidy-limitation amendment by the House last year, I voted for the bill on final passage because I felt that a 4-cent first-class rate was then made fair and equitable. A 4-cent first-class rate cannot, in my opinion, be justified without limiting these unwarranted subsidies.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were: Yeas 381, nays 0, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—381

Abbitt	Barrett	Broomfield
Abernethy	Bass, N. H.	Brown, Ga.
Adair	Bates	Brown, Mo.
Addonizio	Baumhart	Brown, Ohio
Albert	Beamer	Brownson
Alexander	Becker	Broyhill
Alger	Beckworth	Budge
Allen, Ill.	Bennett, Fla.	Burleson
Anderson, H. Carl	Bennett, Mich.	Bush
	Bentley	Byrd
Anderson, Mont.	Berry	Byrne, Ill.
	Betts	Byrne, Pa.
Andrews	Blatnik	Canfield
Anfuso	Blitch	Cannon
Arends	Boggs	Carrigg
Ashley	Boland	Cederberg
Ashmore	Bolling	Celler
Aspinall	Bolton	Chamberlain
Avery	Bosch	Chelf
Ayres	Bow	Chenoweth
Bailey	Boykin	Chiperfield
Baker	Boyle	Christopher
Baldwin	Bray	Church
Barden	Breeding	Clark
Baring	Brooks, Tex.	Clevenger
Coad	Jensen	Preston
Coffin	Johansen	Price
Collier	Johnson	Prouty
Cooley	Jonas	Quie
Corbett	Jones, Ala.	Rabaut
Coudert	Jones, Mo.	Rains
Cramer	Judd	Ray
Cretella	Karsten	Reece, Tenn.
Cunningham, Iowa	Kean	Reed
	Kearns	Rees, Kans.
Cunningham, Nebr.	Keating	Reuss
	Kee	Rhodes, Ariz.
Curtin	Kelly, N. Y.	Rhodes, Pa.
Curtis, Mass.	Keogh	Riehlman
Curtis, Mo.	Kilburn	Rivers
Dague	Kilday	Roberts
Davis, Ga.	Kilgore	Robison, N. Y.
Davis, Tenn.	King	Robsion, Ky.
Dawson, Utah	Kirwan	Rodino
Delaney	Kitchin	Rogers, Col.
Dennison	Knox	Rogers, Fla.
Denton	Krueger	Rogers, Mass.
Derounian	Lafore	Rogers, Tex.
Devereux	Laird	Rooney
Diggs	Landrum	Roosevelt
Dingell	Lane	Rutherford
Dixon	Lankford	Sadlak
Dollinger	Latham	Santangelo
Donohue	LeCompte	St. George
Dooley	Lesinski	Saund
Dorn, N. Y.	Libonati	Saylor
Dorn, S. C.	Lipscomb	Schenck
Doyle	Loser	Scherer
Dwyer	McCormack	Schwengel
Eberharter	McCulloch	Scott, Pa.
Edmondson	McDonough	Scrivner
Elliott	McFall	Scudder
Everett	McGovern	Seely-Brown
Evins	McGregor	Selden
Fallon	McIntire	Sheehan
Farbstein	McIntosh	Shelley
Fascell	McMillan	Sikes
Feighan	McVey	Simpson, Ill.
Fenton	Macdonald	Simpson, Pa.
Fino	Machrowicz	Sisk
Flood	Mack, Ill.	Smith, Calif.
Flynt	Mack, Wash.	Smith, Kans.
Fogarty	Madden	Smith, Miss.
Forand	Magnuson	Smith, Va.
Ford	Mahon	Spence
Forrester	Mailliard	Springer
Fountain	Marshall	Staggers
Frazier	Martin	Stauffer
Frelinghuysen	Mason	Steed
Friedel	Matthews	Sullivan
Fulton	May	Taber
Garmatz	Meader	Talle
Gary	Merrow	Taylor
Gathings	Metcalf	Teague, Calif.
Gavin	Michel	Teague, Tex.
George	Miller, Calif.	Teller
Glenn	Miller, Md.	Tewes
Gordon	Miller, Nebr.	Thomas
Gray	Miller, N. Y.	Thompson, N. J.
Green, Oreg.	Mills	Thompson, Tex.
Green, Pa.	Minshall	Thomson, Wyo.
Griffin	Mitchell	Thornberry
Griffiths	Montoya	Tollefson
Gubser	Moore	Tuck
Gwinn	Morano	Udall
Hagen	Morgan	Ullman
Hale	Morrison	Utt
Haley	Moss	Vanik
Halleck	Moulder	Van Pelt
Harden	Multer	Van Zandt
Hardy	Mumma	Vinson
Harris	Murray	Vorys
Harrison, Nebr.	Natcher	Vursell
Harrison, Va.	Neal	Wainwright
Harvey	Nicholson	Walter
Hays, Ohio	Nimtz	Weaver
Healey	Norblad	Westland
Hébert	Norrell	Wharton
Hemphill	O'Brien, Ill.	Whitener
Henderson	O'Brien, N. Y.	Whitten
Herlong	O'Hara, Ill.	Widnall
Heselton	O'Hara, Minn.	Wier
Hess	O'Konski	Wigglesworth
Hiestand	O'Neill	Williams, Miss.
Hill	Osmers	Williams, N. Y.
Hoeven	Ostertag	Willis
Hoffman	Passman	Wilson, Calif.
Holland	Patman	Wilson, Ind.
Holmes	Patterson	Winstead
Holt	Pelly	Withrow
Holtzman	Perkins	Wolverton
Horan	Pfost	Wright
Hosmer	Philbin	Yates
Huddleston	Pilcher	Young
Hyde	Pillion	Younger
Ikard	Poage	Zablocki
Jackson	Poff	Zelenko
Jarman	Polk	
Jennings	Porter	

NOT VOTING—48

Allen, Calif.	Durham	Knutson
Auchincloss	Engle	Lennon
Bass, Tenn.	Fisher	McCarthy
Belcher	Granahan	Morris
Bonner	Grant	Powell
Brooks, La.	Gregory	Radwan
Buckley	Gross	Riley
Burdick	Haskell	Robeson, Va.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hays, Ark.	Scott, N. C.
Carnahan	Hillings	Sheppard
Colmer	Holifield	Shuford
Dawson, Ill.	Hull	Sieminski
Dellay	James	Siler
Dent	Jenkins	Thompson, La.
Dies	Kearney	Trimble
Dowdy	Kluczynski	Watts

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Scott of North Carolina with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Haskell.
Mr. Durham with Mr. James.
Mr. Robeson with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Radwan.
Mrs. Granahan with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Hillings.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution authorizing the purchase of floral wreaths to be placed in the rotunda of the Capitol for the ceremonies in connection with the Unknown Soldiers.

ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF ALASKA INTO THE UNION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union; and pending that I ask unanimous consent that further general debate be limited to the balance of today, all of tomorrow, and until 2 p. m. on Monday, May 26; one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and one-half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is great interest in this bill, and there are a great many Members who would like to be heard. I wish the gentleman would not make that request today. We will try to get along the best we can. I hope the gentleman will not insist on the unanimous-consent request at this time.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado does insist on his request. He understands the position of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7999, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour or any part thereof.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, 97 years ago, on February 22, 1861, a new American flag was raised over Independence Hall in the city of Philadelphia. That flag was new because it had in it an additional star for the 34th State to enter our Union. Kansas had become a State on January 29, 1861. Significant enough, Kansas had only been an organized Territory for 7 short years, since May 30, 1854.

As he raised that new flag with 34 stars, one of the greatest Americans of all times, President-elect Abraham Lincoln said:

I think we may promise ourselves that not only the new star placed upon that flag shall be permitted to remain there to our permanent posterity for years to come, but additional ones shall from time to time be placed there until we shall number, as it is anticipated by the great historian, 500 millions of happy and prosperous people.

Mr. Chairman, Alaska became a Territory only 6 years after that prophetic statement by Abraham Lincoln. It has been an organized Territory since 1912, longer than any other Territory in the history of this country; yet we are still engaged in trying to pass a bill to admit the Territory of Alaska to the sisterhood of States.

The question of statehood for Alaska has been before the Congress for 40 years, since 1916 when Alaska's great and foresighted Delegate, Judge James Wickersham, introduced the first statehood bill. At no time has this matter been of greater urgency than today when this thoroughly American Territory humbly but insistently knocks at the door of the Union. Simple justice demands that we respond to Alaska's petitions and admit her into the Union as a State.

Over the years the committees of the Congress have minutely examined the proposal to grant statehood to our northernmost Territory. They have compiled hundreds upon hundreds of pages of testimony and evidence which demonstrate beyond question that Alaska is ready for and should be granted statehood.

Through these years, the committees have held hearings not only in Washington, D. C., but in the Territory itself where the private citizen, the man with small means, the homesteader, the miner, the fisherman, and the businessman, had full opportunity to be heard. Witness after witness has asked that Alaska be admitted into the Union as a State. Among Alaskans, witnesses opposing statehood were in the minority.

The arguments against statehood are few. Some say that Alaska's population is too small, but it is larger today than that of several of our States when they were admitted to the Union. Each year since 1950 has seen more and more permanent civilian residents in the Territory. Statehood can be expected to result in a rapid growth of Alaska's population and industry.

Others say that Alaska is not contiguous. Noncontiguity was no obstacle when in 1867 Alaska was purchased. It has not since been an obstacle to the thousands of Americans who have gone to Alaska to build their homes, establish industries, and to create a new State for our Union.

Noncontiguity is not a new argument. It was used against the admission of California and against the admission of Oregon. Both were then noncontiguous to the existing States. Had the proponents of those views prevailed, those States would have waited many years before being admitted into the Union where they contribute so richly to our national fiber.

So, too, with Alaska. With today's great advances in transportation and communication, our world is rapidly shrinking. The arduous and hazardous journey of a century ago is but a day's or a few hours' trip. Why should we pale at the thought of a few hundred miles of water when our great and foresighted predecessors did not pale at hundreds of miles of little-known lands inhabited by few but hostile Indians.

Still others argue that Alaska is too dependent on the Federal Government. They point to Federal expenditures in the Territory, without regard to their purpose or to their necessity from the standpoint of the Nation as a whole.

Alaska participates in most of the grant-in-aid programs which have been authorized by the Congress. Alaska must contribute its share in those programs. In fiscal year 1957 the Territory received less than $10 million from the Federal Government. Forty-six of the States received more; only 2 received less. This is no Federal subsidy which would disqualify Alaska from statehood.

The largest Federal expenditure in Alaska is for defense purposes, for the construction of military bases and for their operation and maintenance. For the past few years Alaska defense construction has cost approximately $100 million a year. It is a substantial figure and contributes greatly to Alaska's economic life. But this money is not spent because Alaska is a Territory. It is not something handed to the Territory because we feel we should subsidize Alaska. This defense program exists because Alaska occupies a highly strategic position in our national defense. The mere act of statehood will not increase or diminish the need.

But, if Alaskans are financially dependent upon the Federal Government, a major cause is the iron control over Alaska exercised by the Federal Government. Ninety-nine percent of Alaska's land is held by the Federal Government and the choice areas, more than 95 million acres, have been reserved for Federal agencies. Control over the Territory's valuable natural resources is not in the hands of Alaskans who must derive their livelihood from local resources, but in the hands of the Federal Government in Washington.

In every case in the past, statehood has been followed by a rapid growth in population and industrial development. Alaska has a vast potential of natural resources; these resources have been and will be of high importance to our Nation. Their development will be facilitated by statehood, thereby broadening Alaska's economic base and reducing such dependence as there may be on Federal expenditures.

Alaska has met every test put to prospective States by the Congress. Of this there is no question. Alaska has been and is contributing her full share to our great Nation. Justice demands favorable action on the statehood legislation now before this body.

I have heard some very significant statements made here on the floor of the House with regard to the Supreme Court of the United States expressing the hope that someday we would get back to the place where that Court commanded the respect in which it was once held. I would call to the attention of those opposing statehood that in the days when the Supreme Court occupied the position they feel it once held, and some of us are of the opinion that it still occupies that exalted position, the Supreme Court stated that once the Houses of Congress makes a Territory, an incorporated Territory, it is an embryonic State, and that the only thing that remains for admission to statehood is for the incorporated Territory to comply with all of the requirements that Congress may lay down for statehood.

I can say to the members of this committee that the Territory of Alaska has met every requirement that has ever been laid down by the Houses of Congress for the admission of any Territory to statehood since the Original Thirteen Colonies.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Would the gentleman please document those requirements for me?

Mr. SAYLOR. I think if the gentleman will look at my revised remarks in tomorrow's RECORD he will find them there.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I prefer to have them documented today, if possible.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the arguments against statehood are few. Some say that Alaska's population is too small. But, it is much larger today than that of several of our States when they were admitted into the Union. Each year since 1950, has seen more and more permanent residents in the Territory. Statehood can be expected to result in a rapid growth of Alaska's population. And, I make that statement because, if you will examine the arguments that have been made by the opponents of other Territories being admitted into the sisterhood of States, they have uniformly played down the size of the population in each one of these Territories, and yet, shortly after admission into statehood, each one of those Territories following the Original Thirteen States has grown.

Now, it is interesting at this point, I believe, to look at the Thirteen Original Colonies that became the United States of America. We are prone to think that New York, today the State with the largest population, Pennsylvania the State with the second largest population, were the first two States, in that order, at the time the Thirteen Colonies became the original United States. If you will examine the record, you will find that that is not the case; that the State with the largest population in the Original Thirteen was Virginia; that the State with the second largest population was Pennsylvania; that the State with the third largest population was Massachusetts; that the State with the fourth largest population was North Carolina; and that the State with the fifth largest population was New York. Just slightly ahead of Maryland the State with the sixth largest population.

Now, our Founding Fathers realized that there would be inequities between the large States and the small States, so they made sure that the small States would not be discriminated against, and they provided that each State, regardless of its size, would have two Senators. We have followed that policy in the admission of the other 35 States into the Union, so that in the United States Senate, regardless of its size, whether it be large in population or large in area, whether it have only 1 or 2 industries or whether it be a State with diversified industries, each State should have 2 Senators. The State of New York has grown and prospered, and some of those who were Senators from that great State were out in the forefront fighting to see to it that the other 35 States were admitted into the Union, and they did not worry that 1 State, with a small population, might have equal voting rights in the Senate.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68]

Allen, Calif.	Celler	Engle
Auchincloss	Clark	Fisher
Bass, Tenn.	Colmer	Granahan
Belcher	Curtis, Mass.	Grant
Blatnik	Dawson, Ill.	Gregory
Bonner	Dellay	Gross
Brooks, La.	Dent	Gubser
Buckley	Dies	Haskell
Burdick	Dowdy	Hays, Ark.
Byrnes, Wis.	Durham	Hillings
Carnahan	Edmondson	Holifield
James	Morris	Shuford
Jenkins	Powell	Sieminski
Kearney	Radwan	Siler
Kluczynski	Riley	Taylor
Knutson	Robeson, Va.	Trimble
Lennon	Saund	Utt
McCarthy	Scott, N. C.	Watts
McCulloch	Sheppard	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7999, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 365 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] has the floor.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, before the roll call I commented on the fact that in the admission of the 35 States to the Union since the Original Thirteen Colonies became the United States of America, the Senators and the Members of Congress from the great State of New York had been in the forefront in leading the fight for the admission of those other States. But we need not look back to history because yesterday, in this House, a majority of the members of the delegation from New York voted to consider this bill. I have here a letter from the present Governor of the State of New York. It is addressed to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]. I would like to read this letter because I think it expresses the views of some people in authority in the great State of New York. It is dated May 9, 1958.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, May 9, 1958.

The Honorable LEO W. O'BRIEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEO: Writing from our Capitol in Albany, in the heart of your 30th New York Congressional District, I want to express my great pleasure that the Alaska statehood bill, H. R. 7999, carries your name. It is of genuine importance to all the American people that it be enacted by a rousing majority at this session of the Congress.

As a young boy I visited Alaska with my father and from that moment have had the keenest interest in the immense possibilities of its future. It is self-evident that many of these possibilities will not be realized until Alaska attains the mature status of statehood and joins its sister States as an equal partner in our national life. Statehood for Alaska is overdue. To delay it further would be gravely unwise as well as seriously unjust. It is in the interest of all Americans that statehood be granted immediately. It is the emphatic wish of the great majority of Americans that it should be. The rights of the people of Alaska as well as the wishes of the American public should no longer be thwarted.

I wish you every success in your effort which partakes in the highest degree of that selfless concern to do the right thing by the American Nation and people, which is the mark of true patriotism.

Sincerely,

AVERELL HARRIMAN.

A few days ago each one of the Members of the House received a letter from the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. That letter makes two points which are, in my opinion, meant to smear the cause of statehood with a giveaway label. This is a red herring out of the creel of an avowed opponent of statehood, and I believe should be recognized as a red herring and treated as such.

First, we are told that granting land to the new State of Alaska is a giveaway. Certainly every State outside the original 13 States has received grants of land upon admission into the Union. Almost 100 percent of the lands in the original States were retained either in private ownership or in the name of the State—we may skip that minor fact for the moment.

But, we do have an agreed principle, applicable to 35 States prior to Alaska: Each new State deserves land grants. The haggling, as usual, is about the amount, not the principle that Alaska deserves some grants.

The United States now owns 99 percent of the lands in Alaska. No other State has ever been in such circumstance upon admission into the Union. The bill before this House would grant 182,800,000 acres to Alaska—and the United States would still own over 50 percent of the area in Alaska. I think it should be pointed out that approximately 95 million acres are already withdrawn—set aside for Federal purposes in Alaska. And more, necessary, large withdrawals are contemplated at this very minute—one comprising 9,000 square miles in the Arctic.

With over a fourth of Alaska withdrawn, and with many acres unsuitable for development, the 182,800,000 acres mentioned in H. R. 7999 is more than likely unrealistic. I doubt that the State could, in 25 years select that many suitable acres. And it would cost approximately $120 million to complete a rectangular survey of 182 million acres in Alaska—that is, to survey and subdivide this area into sections. One hundred and eighty-two million acres equals about 7,960 townships—there are 72 miles to a township, including 12 miles of township boundaries. The cost is about $200 per mile or $15,000 per township. It would cost less, about $20 million, to survey the same area in township units only.

So—to make it a grant of 50 million acres—or 250 million—the plain fact is that Alaska cannot get any of this land until it is surveyed. And the land selected must be "vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved." I would hope and pray that whatever is granted to Alaska will be surveyed promptly.

Now, about the amount of land. In every other State, a greater percentage of the land was in private ownership at the time it was admitted into the Union than now exists in Alaska. The Alaska grant should recognize that Alaska has neither an agricultural or industrial base for its economy. It needs lands in private ownership—it needs lands to stimulate development.

In the case of Florida, the land granted to that State as of June 30, 1957, constituted 69.7 percent of the total land area. Louisiana had 39.6 percent, Arkansas 35.4 percent, Michigan 33.3 percent, Minnesota, 32.1 percent.

Now we who favor statehood for Alaska are not adamant about the amount of land granted to the new State. We do think it should be a sufficient amount to enable the State to have enough to build its economy on a firm base. It should at least own as much land as the Federal Government has seen fit to reserve for Federal purposes. Surely no Member of this Congress wants this House to believe that he believes in the all-powerful feudal Federal landlord—the benevolent bureaucracy—doling out bits of land upon which the State might build universities, county seats, playgrounds, schools, or sell to establish private industry within the State. Those who are at present time favoring that attitude come in here on other occasions and claim that they are strong advocates of States rights. The inconsistency of their position, I think, is apparent.

Now, that same letter addressed to all Members mentioned a gimmick. The author says that in giving Alaska the right to select mineral lands, we are doing something never before done for any State. The Alaskans will watch, says the author of that letter, the mineral discoveries for 25 years and make selections where valuable minerals are discovered. Now, surely not only the author of that letter, but all Members of Congress should have Public Law 88 of the 85th Congress before them, the Congress in which we are now sitting as Members. That bill passed on the Consent Calendar, and enacted into law, gives to Alaska, mark you, 90 percent of the revenues from mineral developments in Alaska without assuming any management responsibilities and without any administrative costs. Why in heaven's name anyone could impugn improper motives to the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who wrote this bill, giving the State of Alaska the right to select minerals when the Territory already receives 90 percent of the income from the minerals is beyond my comprehension.

As I said before, I think that we have in this letter the spectacle of the red herring and the big exaggeration combined. Reflect, if you will, a moment, and you will realize that we have already made the giveaway, if that is the way you want to consider what we did with Alaska. But to those of us who believe in giving to that Territory the right to receive the income from minerals that are located in that Territory, it is not a giveaway, because the folks who live in Alaska are American citizens. It is no more a giveaway than the legislation which the people who are in favor of States rights stood here in the well of the House a few sessions ago and saw to it that we pass a bill returning the tidelands to the States.

Unless the author of that letter wants us to believe that these minerals have value beyond their potential income-producing capacity, it is impossible to imagine what objection there may be to permitting the State to select the lands, when it gets 90 percent of the revenue already, without selecting them.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to make one further comment on this issue. Because of an act of 1927 the present States can now select mineral lands. Oklahoma has received mineral rights in her original grants and Alaska will not receive the usual school sections under this bill. The quantity grants are made in lieu of specific grants for school and other purposes.

Also, although Alaska is given the right to select mineral lands under this bill the State will be required to hold title to these minerals forever. She must reserve no minerals to the State or forfeit the land back to the United States.

On public domain lands, Federal policy pursuant to law permits a miner to get title to the land and the hard rock minerals. Nothing more need be said. We are considering a bill which imposes more stringent conditions on Alaska than we are going to impose upon the Federal lands which will remain in Federal ownership in the State of Alaska.

The following is a tabulation of the acreage granted to the States and Territories as of June 30, 1953:

Acreage granted to States and Territories, as of June 30, 1953 [1]

State	For common schools	For other schools	For other institutions	For railroads	For wagon roads	For canals and rivers	For miscellaneous improvements (not specified)	For swamp reclamation	For other purposes	Total
Alabama	911,627	383,785	181	2,747,479		[2] 400,016	97,469	441,289	[3] 24,660	5,006,506
Alaska	[4] 21,009,209	[4] 438,250								[4] 21,447,459
Arizona	8,093,156	849,197	500,000						[5] 1,101,400	10,543,753
Arkansas	933,778	196,080		2,563,721			500,000	7,686,555	[6] 56,680	11,936,834
California	5,534,293	196,080					500,000	2,192,678	[7] 400,768	8,823,819
Colorado	3,685,618	138,040	32,000				500,000		[8] 115,946	4,471,604
Connecticut		180,000								180,000
Delaware		90,000								90,000
Florida	975,367	182,160		2,218,705			500,000	20,325,013	[9] 5,120	24,206,305
Georgia		270,000								270,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Acreage granted to States and Territories, as of June 30, 1953 [1]—Continued

State	For common schools	For other schools	For other institutions	For railroads	For wagon roads	For canals and rivers	For miscellaneous improvements (not specified)	For swamp reclamation	For other purposes	Total
Idaho	2,963,698	386,686	[10] 250,000						[11] 654,064	4,254,448
Illinois	996,320	526,080		2,595,133		[2] 324,283	209,086	1,460,164	[12] 123,589	6,234,655
Indiana	668,578	436,080			170,580	[2] 1,480,409		1,259,231	[13] 25,600	4,040,478
Iowa	1,000,679	286,080		4,706,945		[2] 321,342	500,000	1,196,392	[14] 49,824	8,061,262
Kansas	2,907,520	151,269	127	4,176,329			500,000		[15] 59,423	7,794,668
Kentucky		330,000	24,606							354,606
Louisiana	807,271	256,292		373,057			500,000	9,493,456		11,430,076
Maine		210,000								210,000
Maryland		210,000								210,000
Massachusetts		360,000								360,000
Michigan	1,021,867	286,080		3,134,058	221,013	[2] 1,251,236	500,000	5,680,310	[16] 49,280	12,143,844
Minnesota	2,874,951	212,160		[17] 8,047,469			500,000	4,706,503	[18] 80,880	[19] 16,421,963
Mississippi	824,213	348,240		1,075,345			500,000	3,347,860	[9] 1,253	6,096,911
Missouri	1,221,813	376,080		1,837,968			500,000	3,432,481	[20] 48,640	7,416,982
Montana	5,198,258	388,721	100,000	[19]					[21] 276,359	[19] 5,963,338
Nebraska	2,730,951	136,080	32,000				500,000		[22] 59,680	3,458,711
Nevada	2,061,967	136,080	12,800				500,000		[23] 14,379	2,725,226
New Hampshire		150,000								150,000
New Jersey		210,000								210,000
New Mexico	8,711,324	1,346,546	750,000			[2] 100,000			[24] 1,886,789	12,794,659
New York		990,000								990,000
North Carolina		270,000								270,000
North Dakota	2,495,396	336,080	[1] 250,000	[19]					[25] 82,076	[19] 3,163,552
Ohio	724,266	699,120			80,774	[2] 1,204,114		26,372	[26] 24,216	2,758,862
Oklahoma	1,375,000	1,050,000	[1] 670,760							3,095,760
Oregon	3,399,360	136,165			[27] 2,583,850		500,000	286,108	[28] 127,324	[29] 7,032,847
Pennsylvania		780,000								780,000
Rhode Island		120,000								120,000
South Carolina		180,000								180,000
South Dakota	2,733,084	366,080	[10] 250,640						[30] 85,509	3,435,373
Tennessee		300,000								300,000
Texas		180,000								180,000
Utah	5,844,196	556,141	500,160						[31] 601,240	7,501,737
Vermont		150,000								150,000
Virginia		300,000								300,000
Washington	2,376,391	336,080	[10] 200,000	[19]					[32] 132,000	[19] 3,044,471
West Virginia		150,000								150,000
Wisconsin	982,329	332,160		3,652,322	302,931	[2] 1,022,349	500,000	3,360,786	[33] 26,400	10,179,277
Wyoming	3,470,000	136,080	[10] 420,000						[34] 316,341	4,342,520
Total	[4] 98,532,429	[35] 17,033,972	[36] 3,933,274	37,128,531	[29] 3,359,188	[37] 6,103,749	7,806,555	64,895,218	[10] 6,429,590	[38] 245,282,506

[1] For additional information concerning these grants, see the Report of the Director, 1947, Statistical Appendix, pp. 118–135; 1948, p. 59; 1949, p. 59; 1950, p. 58; 1951, p. 61, 1952, p. 61.
[2] See footnote 37.
[3] Salt springs, 23,040; seat of government, 1,620.
[4] Except for 102,500 acres granted to the Territory for university purposes, the lands in Alaska are reserved pending statehood.
[5] Park and other purposes, 1,400; payment of bonds, 1,000,000; public buildings, 100,000.
[6] Public buildings, 10,600; salt springs, 46,080.
[7] Public buildings, 6,400; parks, 394,368.
[8] Biological station, 160; public buildings, 32,000; salt springs, 46,080; Carey Acts, 37,706.
[9] Seat of government.
[10] See footnote 36.
[11] Fish and game, 232; hot springs, 187; park, 6,751; public buildings, 32,000; Carey Acts, 614,894.
[12] Salt springs, 121,099; seat of government, 2,560.
[13] Salt springs, 23,040; seat of government, 2,560.
[14] Park, 544; public buildings, 3,200; salt springs, 46,080.
[15] Bridge, 3,922; game preserve, 3,021; public buildings, 6,400; salt springs, 46,080.
[16] Public buildings, 3,200; salt springs, 46,080.
[17] Includes not more than 65,000 acres of lands in Montana, North Dakota, and Washington which were selected by a grantee of the State of Minnesota.
[18] Forestry, 20,000; military purposes, 8; park, 8,392; public buildings, 6,400; salt springs, 46,080.
[19] See footnote 17.
[20] Salt springs, 46,080; seat of government, 2,560.
[21] Militia camp, 640; park, 1,439; public buildings, 182,000; Carey Acts, 92,280.
[22] Agricultural experiments, 800; public buildings, 12,800; salt springs, 46,080.
[23] Public buildings, 12,800; Carey Acts, 1,579.
[24] Payment of bonds, 1,000,000; public buildings, 132,000; reimbursement of local governments, 250,000; reservoirs, 500,000; not specified, 46; Carey Acts, 4,743.
[25] Historical Society, 76; public buildings, 82,000.
[26] Salt springs.
[27] Includes about 93,000 acres, title to which was reconveyed to the United States pursuant to the act of Feb. 26, 1919 (40 Stat. 1197).
[28] Parks, 1,402; public buildings, 6,400; salt springs, 46,080; Carey Acts 73,442.
[29] See footnote 27.
[30] Military camp, 640; missionary work, 160; parks, 2,769; public buildings, 82,000.
[31] Public buildings, 64,000; reservoirs, 500,000; Carey Acts, 37,240.
[32] Public buildings.
[33] Forestry, 20,000; public buildings, 6,400.
[34] Fish hatchery, 5,480; public buildings, 107,000; salt springs, 640; Carey Acts, 203,311.
[35] See footnotes 4 and 36.
[36] Includes acreage of grants for "educational and charitable" purposes, as follows: Idaho, 150,000; North Dakota, 170,000; South Dakota, 170,000; and Washington, 200,000; includes 669,000 acres granted to Oklahoma for "charitable, penal, and public building" purposes, and 290,000 acres granted to Wyoming for "charitable, penal, educational" and other institutions.
[37] Grants for river improvement projects, 1,505,080 acres, as follows: Alabama, 400,016; Iowa, 321,342; New Mexico, 100,000; and Wisconsin, 683,722. Grants for canals, 4,598,669 acres.
[38] See footnotes 4 and 27.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Land Management, Report of the Director, 1953, Statistical Appendix, Washington, D. C., table 115, pp. 132–133.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-eight Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 69]

Auchincloss	Colmer	Hays, Ark.
Bass, Tenn.	Dawson, Ill.	Hillings
Belcher	Dent	Holifield
Blatnik	Dies	Horan
Bonner	Dowdy	James
Brooks, La.	Durham	Jenkins
Buckley	Eberharter	Kearney
Burdick	Edmondson	Keating
Byrnes, Wis.	Engle	Kluczynski
Carnahan	Granahan	Knutson
Celler	Grant	Lankford
Chamberlain	Gregory	Lennon
Christopher	Gross	Lesinski
Clark	Gubser	McCarthy
Collier	Haskell	Machrowicz
Morris	St. George	Smith, Miss.
Osmers	Scott, N. C.	Spence
Powell	Sheppard	Trimble
Radwan	Shuford	Van Pelt
Riley	Sieminski	Watts
Robeson, Va.	Siler	Withrow

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7999, to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 364 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, few items of legislation under consideration by the Congress have inspired the national interest to the extent as has statehood for the Territory of Alaska. Interest in our northernmost Territory, long known only to a handful, has increased by leaps and bounds since World War II when Alaska's strategic importance and her natural resources focused attention on this great land.

Each year more and more settlers and businessmen have moved to Alaska to carve out a new life in the highest tradition of our Nation. Almost overnight Alaska's communities, such as Anchorage and Fairbanks, have been converted from small frontier towns to modern cosmopolitan cities. Alaska is pulsing with a new and vibrant life.

During the last 8 years, Alaska's civilian population has increased by a phenomenal 53 percent. For the most part, these new residents are young and

confident in their future and that of now their Territory, but their expectant State of Alaska. They are people who have had the typical pioneering American background and drive, wanting to find for themselves a new home. They have gone to Alaska, and they are confident of themselves and confident in the future that Alaska holds for them.

They are very much in favor of statehood because they come from every State in the Union, and they have been thoroughly imbued with our American social, political, and economic philosophy. They are interested in having created a new State, and they want a new star to be added to our flag, and this new State, the 49th to be added to our Union.

At long last the wisdom and foresight of Secretary of State William H. Seward, is bearing fruit. The vast and little-known land that he urged the United States to purchase for a ridiculous few cents an acre has proved over and over again to be a valuable, an indispensable, asset to our Nation. If for no other reason, Alaska deserves to participate fully in our political life through statehood in order to complete its destiny. It has long been awaiting statehood—over 90 years have elapsed since Secretary Seward's farsighted action.

Since 1947 committees of the Congress have held long and detailed hearings on the question of Alaskan statehood. They have consistently, since 1948, recommended that statehood be granted Alaska. In so doing, they have found that Alaska has met each of the traditional tests imposed on Territories seeking statehood. Alaskans are imbued with and are sympathetic toward the principles of democracy as exemplified in the American form of Government. And, the proposed new State of Alaska has sufficient population and resources to support State government and to carry its share of the Federal Government.

Never has Alaska's devotion to American democratic principles of government been doubted.

A question has been raised, however, as to whether a majority of the electorate desires statehood. This can be answered by votes which have been cast. In a 1946 referendum, the people of Alaska voted 9,630 to 6,822 in favor of statehood. In 1955 Alaskans voted for delegates to a convention to draft a proposed constitution for the new State. In April 1956 the draft constitution was overwhelmingly ratified by the voters. Every action of the Alaskan electorate in 1946, 1955, and 1956 was to speed the day when Alaska will be admitted into the Union as a State.

In April of this year the Territory held its primary elections. Both the present Delegate to Congress, an avowed statehood proponent, and the Republican prostatehood candidate, were supported convincingly. An antistatehood candidate was ignominiously defeated. The evidence is clear that Republican and Democrats alike in Alaska agree that the Territory should become a State.

Has Alaska sufficient population and resources to meet the cost of State government? The answer can only be "Yes." The Territory has more population than many of the States when they were admitted into the Union. As their population increased after statehood, so will Alaska's. From Alaska's vast mountain ranges, her forests, her mineral deposits and agricultural lands, and her fisheries, already flow revenue more than sufficient to meet the cost of State government.

Despite the limitations of the Territory's 1912 Organic Act, Alaska has created most of the governmental agencies found in the States, and these agencies now perform most of the services performed in the States. In other words, Alaska's Territorial government now functions almost as a State government would. Estimates of the additional cost of statehood vary but all indications are that Alaska will be able to match the increased expense with greater revenue based upon an expanded economy.

Interest in Alaska statehood is not confined to the Territory. Throughout the United States, opinion is growing that a 49th star should be added to the flag through the grant of statehood to Alaska. This opinion is shared in all sections.

More than a decade ago, the Gallup poll, one of the leading indexes of public opinion, showed that 64 percent of the American people were in favor of Alaskan statehood, while only 12 percent were opposed—a record of 5 to 1 in favor of statehood. In March of this year 73 percent of the American people were in favor of Alaskan statehood, while opposition dwindled to 6 percent. Thus, in 1946 opinion was 5 to 1 in favor of statehood, while today opinion is 12 to 1 in favor of admitting Alaska into the Union as a State.

The American people are aware that with every State added to the Union our Nation has increased in strength and wealth. They are aware that the addition of Alaska will further increase our stature. The will of the people must be served, and statehood cannot much longer be delayed. To the 85th Congress belongs the honor of granting statehood to our great northernmost Territory of Alaska.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. In line with the observation the gentleman from Pennsylvania is making, I wish to recall that when my own State, the last State to be admitted to the Union, came in—I know the gentleman has read some of the speeches in the Senate that were delivered—some of those who spoke said there was very little out there in that desert country, that it was inhabited by rocks, rattlesnakes, and, I think, a few Mexicans. In view of the developments that have taken place since then, particularly modern air conditioning, reclamation, and so forth, the State of Arizona today is the second fastest growing State in the Union. Does not the gentleman feel that some of the predictions we have heard that there would not be growth or development might prove to be false?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am satisfied that the predictions that were made for Arizona will never happen, and what has happened to Arizona is only proof of the fact that those who sponsored statehood for Arizona were really looking forward to the great interests of our country.

I might say that in looking over the debates of some of the other State admissions, it is interesting to note that, for example, when the Territory of Minnesota was being debated as to whether or not it would become a State, there were those who stood in the well of this House and on the floor of the Senate and said that if Minnesota was ever admitted to statehood, all that you would ever do would be to permit a few timber barons to go into that great Territory, strip it of all its wealth, and then leave it for the Indians and the beavers. I know that those folks who come from Minnesota today look with pride on their great State.

I know that when I read the debates on the admission on the great State of Mississippi to the Union, I was particularly intrigued with the remarks of a man who has been known as a famous Senator, Daniel Webster, and this was his prediction with regard to that State, that if the people of the United States ever admitted those red-legged wildmen from the bayous of Mississippi to statehood, it would not be safe for the fair womanhood of New England to walk the streets in daylight, let alone the dark, and that if they overrode his objections, he would immediately return to New England and proposed that New England secede from the United States and form a new country. Yet, as I look at the men who represent the great State of Mississippi in this House and in the Senate, I am satisfied that the folks in New England still walk the streets in the daylight without fear and that Mississippi, together with the other States, has contributed greatly to the welfare of this country.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. In order that the situation of the three States just mentioned by the gentleman may be considered in context, at the time Arizona was admitted she had 0.221 of the total United States population, Minnesota had 0.547, Mississippi had 0.7827. Alaska at the present time has only about 0.0853 of 1 percent of the population of the United States.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and I am satisfied if Alaska had 10 million people, he would still be opposed to it. However, the figures used by the gentleman are very misleading and self-serving. What he should do is to submit the population of each State upon its admission and also the total population of the United States.

Mr. HOSMER. That is incorrect.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Is it not true that conditions today are somewhat different from the conditions that existed when these States were admitted, in that the 17th amendment has now been adopted

and that there have been no States admitted into this Union since the adoption of the 17th amendment, which so drastically changed the method for the selection of our United States Senate, wherein the Senators today are no longer elected by State governments but are elected by the people of the States? And that therefore their responsibility and their accountability are no longer to the State governments but subject to the public pressures of the people whom they represent and to whom they are accountable; that we are no longer a Federal type of government and that the Senate today no longer seeks to preserve the rights of the States but instead is subject to the wishes and the requirements of their various localities and the constituents whom the individual Senators represent.

That makes a tremendous difference in the reason for having two Senators for each State.

Mr. SAYLOR. The answer to that is, that in the opinion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] that is a condition. It is true there have been no States admitted since we changed the constitutional manner in which Senators are now chosen. But that has no bearing whatsoever, and I am satisfied that it is just another hook on which to hang a piece of clothing in an attempt to disguise the real reasons for being against statehood.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask this question. I notice that statistics were used a moment ago of percentage of population represented by these States when they came in. Do those figures apply to the population in those days or do they apply to the population today? Would the gentleman clear that up for the record and indicate the number of residents in Alaska compared to the number of people in the States that recently came in? Would not that bring the discussion more into line so that we could understand the problem?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. I think the figures the gentleman read were the percentages at the time the States came in.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Is it not true that the House of Representatives just 8 years ago voted statehood for Alaska, when it had 100,000 people, and now balks at granting statehood for Alaska when it has 212,000 people?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is quite correct.

Yesterday there were some comments made as to whether or not Alaska is financially able to support statehood. I should like to address the balance of my remarks to an affirmative answer to that question. In my opinion, Alaska is financially able to support statehood. Alaska's growth, especially in the last 15 years of its history, has been tremendous.

In fiscal year 1942, when the Territory had a population of approximately 72,500, the Governor's annual report to the Secretary of the Interior indicates that annual receipts were $3,797,863.23 and disbursements were $3,648,433.38, with a net cash balance of $1,310,015.31 as of June 30, 1942. However, the 23d Territorial Legislature, representing an estimated population of 212,000 persons, convened in Juneau on January 28, 1957, for a regular 60-day session and appropriated $36,248,818.38 for the general fund and $580,527.95 for the highway fund for the biennium ending June 29, 1959. Thus, assuming that the appropriation for fiscal 1958 would be one-half of the biennial figure, or $18,124,409.19, it is significant to note that while the population has increased 2.9 times in 15 years, the financial expenses have increased at a ratio of approximately 4.8 times during the same period.

While the foregoing may be a normal economic result of population growth, the remarkable thing is that, until Public Law 516, 84th Congress, was passed, the Territory was prohibited, by its organic act of 1912, from incurring any indebtedness. And, while the aforementioned law does allow the Territory to borrow on its credit for public improvements, in an amount not to exceed $20 million in bonds outstanding at any one time, the Territory has not as yet chosen to do so.

Alaska's vigorous young Governor, Mike Stepovich, stated in his inaugural address, on June 8, 1957, that he was going to have the tax structure of the Territory examined. Shortly thereafter, he appointed a bipartisan group composed of 2 Territorial senators and 2 Territorial representatives, as his advisory committee for that purpose. While the committee has not yet completed its work, I have learned that on Tuesday, March 11, 1958, Governor Stepovich released an interim report prepared by the committee stating that there is a possibility of a substantial surplus in the Territory's general fund. This, indeed, is especially encouraging.

The advisory committee reported that after 8 months of the current biennium, 31.8 percent of the revenues that should be collected during the 2-year period have been collected, and that the raw-fish tax on the 1957 pack would bring the amount over the desired 33⅓ percent figure. In addition to noting that at the present time the Territory's budget is in balance, the committee stated that the substantial surplus should result from oil-lease revenue returned to the Territory from the Federal Government. This came about from the enactment of Public Law 85–50 of the present 85th Congress which provides that 90 percent of the receipts from the lease and royalty money paid in for oil and gas leases shall go to the Territory of Alaska. Since the discovery of oil on the Kenai Peninsula last summer, I understand that the Anchorage office of the Department of Interior's Bureau of Land Management has done more leasing business in the past half year or so than in the 7 years preceding. As a result, the Territory in February received more than $1,800,000 from oil-lease income for the last 6 months of 1957. The committee anticipates that by July 1, 1958, the Territory will have received in excess of $4 million from these leases. While the committee recognizes that two contingencies might require an alteration in their prediction, they are optimistic that they will remain relatively in the same status as they have in the past few years. These contingencies are: First, the size of the 1958 fish pack, which cannot be predicted; and, second, the possibility of a decrease in the net-income tax which is dependent upon government construction in western Alaska.

Does this not then indicate that the Territory of Alaska is financially able to care for itself? My opponents would say, however, "You have merely shown that the Territory can care for itself as a Territory. What will happen and how will it fare if it becomes a State?" My answer to that is that it will fare very well and that it will support itself satisfactorily.

While it would be somewhat presumptuous to say what the additional expenses of statehood actually will be, it would seem that obvious increases would result from the introduction of a judicial system and from an enlarged legislature. The Governor's office, with its increased duties, would also have increased expenses. Other apparent extra expenses would result from the construction of administrative office buildings, and from the development of a State land department. The highway program could also very well increase annual expenditures, especially if the present 10 to 1 matching ratio used in the Federal Aid Highway Act is modified by the statehood bill.

Undoubtedly, there are other items of expense that might accompany the advent of statehood. However, a certain amount of this total added expense would be offset by fines collected from the State court system, by sports and commercial fish and wildlife licenses, by a transfer of a portion of the proceeds from the Pribiloff Seal Fisheries to the new State as is now proposed in the present statehood bills, by forest leases from Alaska's expanding timber industry, and by Alaska receiving 90 percent of the revenue from oil and gas leases pursuant to the recent enactment I mentioned previously. In addition, while Alaska's current income is largely derived from a Territorial income tax, a business license tax, a tax on fisheries and mines, a liquor and gasoline tax, and from oil and gas leases, nevertheless, it should be remembered that all methods of increasing the sovereignty's revenue have not been exhausted. Thus, as Alaska grows as a State under a new American flag, so too will its tax base broaden in keeping with its expanding economy. In that regard it is interesting to note that, in 1957, Alaska had a higher, per capita general revenue than did 39 of the existing States. Surely then, Alaska will be able to flourish under the banner of statehood.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was temporarily detained outside of the Chamber and did not hear the gentleman's ex-

cellent approach to the mineral-lease part. I understand he took some issue with a letter I had written to the membership some days ago on this subject. Does the gentleman question the accuracy of anything stated in that letter?

Mr. SAYLOR. I certainly do.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman kindly state what that is?

Mr. SAYLOR. I stated that before. I am sorry the gentleman was not here while I was speaking with regard to that letter. I saw him in the back of the Chamber. I called his attention to the fact that he said it was a giveaway, and I called attention to the fact that he must have been here and voted for a law under whose provisions we have already given to the Territory of Alaska 90 percent of the income from mineral leases, and that this bill which we now have before us is more stringent than the present mining laws.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman does not question the accuracy; he just says that I said it was a giveaway.

Mr. SAYLOR. I certainly have. I questioned the accuracy of it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does the gentleman question the accuracy of this statement?

Mr. SAYLOR. I refuse to yield any further. I made the statement while the gentleman was here.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I rather expected the gentleman would when we got down to it.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 70]

Alger	Edmondson	Machrowicz
Allen, Calif.	Engle	Magnuson
Auchincloss	Evins	Miller, Calif.
Bass, Tenn.	Granahan	Morris
Bates	Grant	O'Brien, Ill.
Belcher	Gray	Powell
Blatnik	Gregory	Prouty
Bonner	Gross	Radwan
Breeding	Gubser	Rains
Brooks, La.	Haskell	Riley
Buckley	Hays, Ark.	Robeson, Va.
Burdick	Hillings	Scott, N.C.
Byrnes, Wis.	Holifield	Sheppard
Carnahan	James	Shuford
Celler	Jenkins	Sieminski
Christopher	Kearney	Siler
Clark	Kearns	Smith, Miss.
Collier	Keating	Spence
Colmer	Kluczynski	Teague, Tex.
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Trimble
Dent	Krueger	Van Pelt
Dies	Laird	Vursell
Dowdy	Lennon	Watts
Durham	Lesinski	Westland
Eberharter	Libonati	Withrow

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 354 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, some people have raised the question as to what has been required of the 35 States to be admitted to the Union.

The following are the provisions establishing the method of Federal approval of State constitutions as contained in the enabling acts of States admitted to the Union from 1791 to 1910:

1–2. NEW MEXICO-ARIZONA (INITIAL ACT)

(a) *The act of June 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 267, 278, 280–281)*

(NOTE.—The act of June 16, 1906, constituted enabling legislation for the people of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory, and enabling legislation for the people of New Mexico and of Arizona. Merger of the 2 Territories into 1 State turned on approval by the people of such merger; the merger having been rejected, subsequent enabling legislation, in 1910—as extracted hereafter—provided for individual statehood for the 2 Territories.)

"SEC. 23. That the inhabitants of all that part of the United States now constituting the Territory of Arizona and New Mexico, as at present described, may become the State of Arizona, as hereinafter provided."

* * * * *

"SEC. 26. And if the constitution and government of said proposed State are republican in form, and if the provisions in this act have been complied with in the formation thereof, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States, within 20 days from the receipt of the certificate of the result of said election and the statement of the votes cast thereon and a copy of said constitution, articles, propositions and ordinances from said board, to issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election, and thereupon the proposed State shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union, under and by virtue of this act, under the name of Arizona, on an equal footing with the original States, from and after the date of said proclamation. * * *."

NEW MEXICO (SUBSEQUENT ACT)

(b) *The Act of June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557 and 560)*

"SECTION 1. That the qualified electors of the Territory of New Mexico are hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates to form a constitutional convention for said Territory for the purpose of framing a constitution for the proposed State of New Mexico. * * *."

* * * * *

"SEC. 4. That when said constitution and such provisions thereof as have been separately submitted shall have been duly ratified by the people of New Mexico as aforesaid, a certified copy of the same shall be submitted to the President of the United States and to Congress for approval, together with the statement of the votes cast thereon and upon any provisions thereof which were separately submitted to and voted upon by the people. And if Congress and the President approve said constitution and the said separate provisions thereof, or, if the President approves the same and Congress fails to disapprove the same during the next regular session thereof, then * * * the Governor * * * shall * * * issue his proclamation for the election of State and county officers, * * *."

"SEC. 5. * * * when said election * * * shall be held and returns thereof made * * * the Governor * * * shall certify the result of said election * * * to the President of the United States, who thereupon shall immediately issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election so ascertained, and upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States the proposed State of New Mexico shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union, by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the other States. * * *."

(C) ARIZONA (SUBSEQUENT ACT)

The Act of June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 568, 571, 572)

* * * * *

"SEC. 19. That the qualified electors of the Territory of Arizona are hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates to form a constitutional convention for said Territory for the purpose of framing a constitution for the proposed State of Arizona."

* * * * *

"SEC. 22. That when said constitution and such provisions thereof as have been separately submitted shall have been duly ratified by the people of Arizona as aforesaid, a certified copy of the same shall be submitted to the President of the United States and to Congress for approval, together with the statement of the votes cast thereon and upon any provisions thereof which were separately submitted to and voted upon by the people. And if Congress and the President approve said constitution and the said separate provisions thereof, or, if the President approves the same and Congress fails to disapprove the same during the next regular session thereof, then * * * the Governor * * * shall * * * issue his proclamation for the election of State and county officers, * * *."

"SEC. 23. * * * when said election * * * shall be held and returns thereof made * * * the Governor * * * shall certify the result of said election * * * to the President of the United States, who thereupon shall immediately issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election so ascertained and upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States the proposed State of Arizona shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union, by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the other States * * *."

3. OKLAHOMA

The act of June 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 267, 271)

"SECTION 1. That the inhabitants of all that part of the area of the United States now constituting the Territory of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory, as at present described, may adopt a constitution and become the State of Oklahoma, as hereinafter provided: * * *."

* * * * *

"SEC. 4. * * *. And if the constitution and government of said proposed State are republican in form, and if the provisions in this act have been complied with in the formation thereof, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States, within 20 days from the receipt of the certificate of the result of said election and the statement of votes cast thereon and a copy of said constitution, articles, propositions, and ordinances, to issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election; and thereupon the proposed State of Oklahoma shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union, under and by virtue of this Act, on an equal footing with the original States. * * *."

4. UTAH

The act of July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 107 and 109)

"SEC. 1. That the inhabitants of all that part of the area of the United States now constituting the Territory of Utah, as at present described, may become the State of Utah, as hereinafter provided."

* * * * *

"SEC. 4. * * *. And if the constitution and government of said proposed State are republican in form, and if all the provisions of this act have been complied with in the

formation thereof, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election, and thereupon the proposed State of Utah shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union, under and by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the original States, from and after the date of said proclamation."

5. IDAHO

The act of July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215)

(From preamble)

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Idaho did, on the fourth day of July 1889, by convention of delegates called and assembled for that purpose, form for themselves a constitution, which constitution was ratified and adopted by the people of said Territory at an election held therefor on the first Tuesday in November 1899, which constitution is republican in form and is in conformity with the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas said convention of the people of said Territory have asked the admission of said Territory into the Union of States on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever: Therefore

"SECTION 1. The State of Idaho is hereby declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever; and that the constitution which the people of Idaho have formed for themselves be, and the same is hereby, accepted, ratified, and confirmed."

* * * * *

6. WYOMING

The act of July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222)

(From preamble)

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Wyoming did, on the 30th day of September 1889, by a convention of delegates called and assembled for that purpose, form for themselves a constitution, which constitution was ratified and adopted by the people of said Territory at an election held thereof on the first Tuesday in November 1899, which constitution is republican in form and is in conformity with the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas said convention of the people of said Territory have asked the admission of said Territory into the Union of States on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever: Therefore

"SECTION 1. The State of Wyoming is hereby declared to be a State of the United States of America, and is hereby declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever; and that the constitution which the people of Wyoming have formed for themselves be. and the same is hereby accepted, ratified, and confirmed."

7–10. NORTH DAKOTA, SOUTH DAKOTA, MONTANA, AND WASHINGTON

The act of February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676 and 679)

"SECTION 1. That the inhabitants of all that part of the area of the United States now constituting the Territories of Dakota, Montana, and Washington, as at present described, may become the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, respectively, as hereinafter provided.

* * * * *

"SEC. 8. * * * and if the constitutions and governments of said proposed States are republican in form, and if all the provisions of this act have been complied with in the formation thereof, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to issue his proclamation announcing the result of the election in each, and thereupon the proposed States which have adopted constitutions and formed State governments as herein provided shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union under and by virtue of this act on an equal footing with the original States from and after the date of said proclamation."

11. COLORADO

The act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 474 and 475)

"SECTION 1. That the inhabitants of the Territory of Colorado included in the boundaries hereinafter described be, and they are hereby authorized to form for themselves, out of said Territory, a State government, with the name of the State of Colorado; which State, when formed, shall be admitted into the Union upon an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatsoever, as hereinafter provided."

* * * * *

"SEC. 5. That in case the constitution and State government shall be formed for the people of said Territory of Colorado, in compliance with the provisions of this act * * *; and if a majority of legal votes shall be cast for said constitution in said proposed State, the said acting governor shall certify the same to the President of the United States, together with a copy of said constitution and ordinances; whereupon it shall be the duty of President of the United States to issue his proclamation declaring the State admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, without any further action whatever on the part of Congress."

12. NEVADA

(*a*) *The act of April 19, 1864 (13 Stat. 47, 48–49)*

"SECTION 1. That the inhabitants of that portion of the Territory of Nevada included in the boundaries hereinafter designated be, and they are hereby, authorized to form for themselves, out of said Territory, a State government, with the name aforesaid, which said State, when formed, shall be admitted into the Union upon an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatsoever."

* * * * *

"SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted,* that in case a constitution and State government shall be formed for the people of said Territory of Nevada, in compliance with the provisions of this act * * * and if a majority of legal votes shall be cast for said constitution in said proposed State, the said acting governor shall certify the same to the President of the United States, together with a copy of said constitution and ordinances; whereupon it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to issue his proclamation declaring the State admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, without any further action whatever on the part of Congress."

13. NEBRASKA

The act of April 19, 1864 (13 Stat. 47, 48–49)

"SECTION 1. That the inhabitants of that portion of the Territory of Nebraska included in the boundaries hereinafter designated be, and they are hereby, authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State government, with the name aforesaid, which State, when so formed, shall be admitted to the Union as hereinafter provided."

* * * * *

"SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted,* that in case a constitution and State government shall be formed for the people of said Territory of Nebraska in compliance with the provisions of this act * * * and if a majority of legal votes shall be cast for said constitution in said proposed State, the said acting governor shall certify the same to the President of the United States, together with a copy of said constitution and ordinances; whereupon it shall be the duty of the President of the United States to issue his proclamation declaring the State admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, without any further action whatever on the part of Congress."

NOTE.—President Andrew Johnson returned to the Senate unsigned and with his objections thereto the original Nebraska enabling acts; thereupon the Senate on February 8, 1867 passed, two-thirds of the Senate agreeing, thereto, an Admission Act for the State of Nebraska; on February 9, 1867, the House, in turn, two-thirds of the Members agreeing, passed the—

(*b*) *Act of February 9, 1867 (14 Stat. 391)*

"SECTION 1. That the Constitution and State government which the people of Nebraska have formed for themselves be, and the same is hereby, accepted, ratified, and confirmed, and that the said State of Nebraska shall be, and is hereby declared to be, one of the United States of America, and is hereby admitted into the Union upon an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatsoever."

* * * * *

"SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted,* That this act shall not take effect except upon the fundamental condition that within the State of Nebraska there shall be no denial of the elective franchise, or of any other right, to any person, by reason of race or color, excepting Indians not taxed; and upon the further fundamental condition that the legislature of said State, by a solemn public act, shall declare the assent of said State to the said fundamental condition and shall transmit to the President of the United States an authentic copy of said act; upon receipt thereof thhe President, by proclamation, shall forthwith announce the fact, whereupon said fundamental condition shall be held as a part of the organic law of the State; and thereupon, and without any further proceeding on the part of Congress, the admission of said State into the Union shall be considered as complete. Said State legislature shall be convened by the Territorial governor within 30 days after the passage of this act, to act upon the condition submitted herein."

14. WEST VIRGINIA

The act of December 13, 1862 (12 Stat. 633–634)

(From preamble)

"Whereas the people inhabiting that portion of Virginia known as West Virginia, did, * * * frame for themselves the constitution * * * and whereas * * * the said constitution was approved and adopted * * * and whereas the Legislature of Virginia * * * did give its consent to the formation of a new State within the jurisdiction of the said State of Virginia, to be known by the name of West Virginia * * * and whereas both the convention and the legislature aforesaid have requested that the new State should be admitted into the Union, and the constitution aforesaid being republican in form, Congress doth hereby consent that the said 48 counties may be formed into a separate and independent State. Therefore—

"SECTION 1. The State of West Virginia be, and is hereby, declared to be one of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever * * *: *Provided,* Always that this act shall not take effect until after the proclamation of the President of the United States hereinafter provided for.

* * * * *

[NOTE.—The second paragraph of this Admission Act contained the language of a proposed change in the Constitution of the State of West Virginia having to do with the status of slaves and the children of slaves.]

"SEC. 2. *Be it further enacted,* That whenever the people of West Virginia shall, through their said convention, * * * ratify the change aforesaid, * * * it shall be lawful for the President of the United States to issue a proclamation stating the fact, and thereupon this act shall take effect and be in force from and after 60 days from the date of said proclamation."

[NOTE.—On April 20, 1863, President Abraham Lincoln, in pursuance of the authority vested in him by the act of December 31, 1862, upon finding "proof of a compliance with that condition" described in the 1862 act did declare the 1862 act effective and in force from and after 60 days from April 20, 1863.]

15. KANSAS

The act of January 29, 1861 (12 Stat. 126–127)

(From preamble)

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Kansas * * * did form for themselves a constitution and State government, republican in form, which was ratified and adopted by the people * * * and the said convention has, in their name and behalf, asked the Congress of the United States to admit the said Territory into the Union as a State on an equal footing with the other States: Therefore

"SECTION 1. The State of Kansas shall be, and is hereby declared to be, one of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects.

* * * * *

16. OREGON

The act of February 14, 1859 (11 Stat. 683)

(From preamble)

"Whereas the people of Oregon have framed, ratified, and adopted a constitution of State government which is republican in form, and in conformity with the Constitution of the United States, and have applied for admission into the Union on an equal footing with the other States: Therefore—

"SECTION 1. Oregon be, and she is hereby, received into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever, with the following boundaries * * *."

17. MINNESOTA

(a) *The act of February 26, 1857 (11 Stat. 166)*

"SECTION 1. The inhabitants of that portion of the Territory of Minnesota which is embraced within the following limitation, * * * be and they are hereby authorized to form for themselves a constitution and a State government, by the name of the State of Minnesota, and to come into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, according to the Federal Constitution."

* * * * *

(b) *The act of May 11, 1858 (11 Stat. 285)*

(From preamble)

"Whereas * * * the people of said Territory (Minnesota) did, * * * form for themselves a constitution and State government, which is republican in form, and was ratified and adopted by the people * * * for that purpose: therefore

"SECTION 1. The State of Minnesota shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever."

18. CALIFORNIA

The act of September 9, 1850 (9 Stat. 452–453)

(From preamble)

Whereas the people of California have prepared a constitution and asked admission into the Union, which constitution was submitted to Congress by the President of the United States, by message dated February 13, 1850, and which, on due examination, is found to be republican in its form of government.

"SECTION 1. The State of California shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever."

* * * * *

"SEC. 3. * * * *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed as recognizing or rejecting the propositions tendered by the people of California as articles of compact in the ordinance adopted by the convention which formed the constitution of that State.

19. WISCONSIN

(a) *The act of August 6, 1846 (9 Stat. 56)*

"SEC. 1. The people of the Territory of Wisconsin be, and they are hereby authorized to form a constitution and State government, for the purpose of being admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatsoever, by name of the State of Wisconsin, with the following boundaries, * * *."

(b) *The act of May 29, 1848 (9 Stat. 233)*

(From preamble)

Whereas the people of the territory of Wisconsin did, * * * form for themselves a constitution and State government, which said constitution is republican, and said convention having asked the admission of said Territory into the Union as a State, on an equal footing with the original State:

"SEC. 1. The State of Wisconsin be, and is hereby, admitted to be one of the United States of America, and is hereby admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever * * *."

20–21. FLORIDA AND IOWA

(a) *The act of March 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 742–743)*

(From preamble)

Whereas the people of the Territory of Iowa did, * * * form for themselves a constitution and State government; and whereas, the people of the Territory of Florida did, in like manner, * * * form for themselves a constitution and State government, both of which said constitutions are republican; and said conventions having asked the admission of their respective Territories into the Union as States, on equal footing with the original States;

"SECTION 1. The States of Iowa and Florida be, and the same are hereby, declared to be States of the United States of America, and are hereby admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States in all respects whatsoever."

* * * * *

"SEC. 7. * * * *Provided,* That the ordinance of the convention that formed the constitution of Iowa, and which is appended to the said constitution, shall not be deemed or taken to have any effect or validity, or to be recognized as in any manner obligatory upon the Government of the United States."

IOWA

(Subsequent act)

(b) *The act of December 28, 1846 (9 Stat. 117)*

(From preamble)

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Iowa did, * * * form for themselves a constitution and State government—which constitution is republican in its character and features—and said convention has asked admission of said Territory into the Union as a State, on an equal footing with the original States * * *: Therefore—

"SECTION 1. The State of Iowa shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatsoever."

22. TEXAS

(a) *Act of March 1, 1845 (5 Stat. 797–798)*

(Joint resolution for annexing Texas to the United States)

"SECTION 1. Congress doth consent that the Territory properly included within, and rightfully belonging to the Republic of Texas, may be erected into a new State, to be called the State of Texas, with a republican form of government to be adopted by the people of said republic, by deputies in convention assembled, with the consent of the existing government, in order that the same may be admitted as one of the States of this Union."

"SEC. 2. *And be it further resolved,* That the foregoing consent of Congress is given upon the following conditions, and with the following guaranties, to wit: First, * * * and the constitution thereof, with the proper evidence of its adoption by the people of said Republic of Texas, shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to be laid before Congress for its final action on or before the first day of January 1846. * * * Third. New States, of convenient size, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of Texas, and having sufficient population, may hereafter, by the consent of said State, be formed out of the Territory thereof, which shall be entitled to admission under the provisions of the Federal constitution. * * *"

"SEC. 3. *And be it further resolved,* That if the President of the United States shall in his judgment and discretion deem it most advisable, instead of submitting the foregoing resolution to the Republic of Texas, as an overture on the part of the United States for admission, to negotiate with that Republic; then be it

"Resolved, That a State, to be formed out of the present Republic of Texas, * * * shall be admitted into the Union by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the existing States, as soon as the terms and conditions of such admission, and the cession of the remaining of Texan territory to the United States shall be agreed upon by the Governments of Texas and the United States: And, that the sum of $100,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated to defray the expenses of missions and negotiations, to agree upon the terms of admission and cession, either by treaty to be submitted to the Senate, or by articles to be submitted by the two Houses of Congress, as the President may direct."

(b) *The act of December 29, 1845 (9 Stat. 108)*

(From preamble of joint resolution)

"Whereas the Congress of the United States * * * did consent that the territory properly included within, and rightfully belonging to, the Republic of Texas, might be erected into a new State, to be called 'The State of Texas,' with a republican form of government, to be adopted by the people of said republic, * * * with the consent of the existing government, in order that the same might be admitted as one of the States of the Union; * * * and whereas the people of the said Republic of Texas, * * * did adopt a constitution, and erect a new State with a republican form of government * * * and whereas the said constitution, with the proper evidence of its adoption by the people of the Republic of Texas has been transmitted to the President of the United States and laid before Congress, in conformity to the provisions of said joint resolution: Therefore—

"SECTION 1. The State of Texas shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into

the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever."

23. MICHIGAN

(a) *The act of June 15, 1836 (5 Stat. 49–50)*

* * * * *

"SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted,* That the constitution and State government which the people of Michigan have formed for themselves be, and the same is hereby, accepted, ratified, and confirmed; and that the said State of Michigan shall be, and is hereby, declared to be one of the United States of America, and is hereby admitted into the Union upon an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatsoever * * *."

[NOTE.—There is omitted here quotation of language in a proviso of section 2 which constitutes an express condition precedent to admission of recognition by the proposed State of the boundaries as described therein.]

"SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted,* That, as a compliance with the fundamental condition of admission contained in the last preceding section of this act, the boundaries of the said State of Michigan, as in that section described, declared, and established, shall receive the assent of a convention of delegates elected by the people of the said State, for the sole purpose of giving the assent herein required; and as soon as the assent herein required shall be given, the President of the United States shall announce the same by proclamation; and thereupon, and without any further proceedings on the part of Congress, the admission of the said State into the Union as one of the United States of America, on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever shall be considered as complete, * * *."

(b) *The act of January 26, 1837 (5 Stat. 144)*

(From preamble)

"Whereas, in pursuance of the act of Congress of June 18, 1836. * * * a convention of delegates. * * * did, on the 15th of December 1836 assent to the provisions of said act, therefore:

"SECTION 1. The State of Michigan shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever."

24. ARKANSAS

The act of June 15, 1836 (5 Stat. 50, 51–52)

(From preamble)

"Whereas, the people of the Territory of Arkansas, did, * * * form for themselves a constitution and State government, which constitution and State government, so formed is republican: * * * and the said convention have in their behalf, asked the Congress of the United States to admit the said Territory into the Union as a State, on an equal footing with the original States:

"SECTION 1. The State of Arkansas shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever * * *."

* * * * *

"SEC. 8. *And be it further enacted,* * * * nothing in this act shall be construed as an assent by Congress to all or to any of the propositions contained in the ordinance of the said convention of the people of Arkansas, * * *."

25. MISSOURI

(a) *The act of March 6, 1820 (3 Stat. 545, 546–547, 548)*

"SECTION 1. The inhabitants of that portion of the Missouri territory included within the boundaries hereinafter designated, be, and they are hereby, authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State government, and to assume such name as they shall deem proper; and the said State, when formed, shall be admitted into the Union, upon an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatsoever."

* * * * *

"SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted,* * * * and (the convention) shall then form * * * a constitution and State government: *Provided,* That the same, whenever formed, shall be republican and not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States; * * * ."

* * * * *

"SEC. 7. *And be it further enacted,* That in case a constitution and State government shall be formed for the people of said Territory of Missouri, the said convention or representative, as soon thereafter as may be, shall cause a true and attested copy of such constitution, or frame of State government, as shall be formed or provided, to be transmitted to Congress."

* * * * *

(b) *The act of March 2, 1821 (3 Stat. 645)*

"*Resolved* * * * that Missouri shall be admitted into this Union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever, upon the fundamental condition, that the 4th clause of the 26th section of the third article of the constitution submitted on the part of said State to Congress, shall never be construed to authorize the passage of any law, and that no law shall be passed in conformity thereto, by which any citizens, or either of the States in this Union, shall be excluded from the enjoyment of any of the privileges and immunities to which such citizen is entitled under the Constitution of the United States: *Provided,* That the legislature of said State by a solemn public act, shall declare the assent of said State of the said fundamental condition, and shall transmit to the President of the United States, on or before the fourth Monday in November next, an authentic copy of the said act; upon the receipt whereof, the President, by proclamation, shall announce the fact; whereupon, and without any further proceeding on the part of Congress, the admission of the said State into this Union shall be considered as complete."

26. MAINE

The act of March 3, 1820 (3 Stat. 544)

(From preamble)

"Whereas by an act of the State of Massachusetts, passed on the 19th day of June, in the year 1819, entitled 'an act relating to the separation of the district of Maine from Massachusetts proper, and forming the same into a separate and independent State, the people of that part of Massachusetts heretofore known as the district of Maine, did, with the consent of the legislature of said State of Massachusetts, form themselves into an independent State, and did establish a constitution for the government of the same, agreeably to the provisions of said act— Therefore,

"SECTION 1. That from and after the 15th day of March, in the year 1820, the State of Maine is hereby declared to be one of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever."

27. ALABAMA

(a) *The act of March 2, 1819 (3 Stat. 489–492)*

"SECTION 1. The inhabitants of the territory of Alabama be, and they are hereby, authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State government, and to assume such name as they may deem proper; and that the said territory when formed into a State, shall be admitted into the Union, upon the same footing with the original States, in all respects whatever."

* * * * *

"SEC. 9. *And be it further enacted,* that, in case the said convention shall form a constitution and State government for the people of the territory of Alabama, the said convention, as soon thereafter as may be, shall cause a true and attested copy of such constitution or frame of government as shall be formed or provided, to be transmitted to Congress, for its approbation."

(b) *The act of December 14, 1819 (3 Stat. 608)*

(From preamble of resolution of admission)

"Whereas * * * the people of the Alabama territory * * * did * * * form for themselves a constitution and State government, which constitution and State government, so formed, is republican, and in conformity to the principles of the articles of the compact between the original States and the people and States in the territory northwest of the river Ohio, passed on the 13th day of July 1787, as far as the same have been extended to the said territory, by the articles of agreement betwen the United States and the State of Georgia:—

"*Resolved* * * * the State of Alabama shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever."

28. ILLINOIS

The act of April 18, 1818 (3 Stat. 428–430)

"SECTION 1. The inhabitants of the territory of Illinois be, and they are hereby, authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State government, and to assume such name as they shall deem proper; and the said State, when formed shall be admitted into the Union upon the same footing with the original States, in all respects whatever."

* * * * *

"SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted,* * * * said representatives * * * shall then form for the people of said Territory a constitution and State government: *Provided,* That the same, whenever formed, shall be republican and not repugnant to the ordinance of the 13th of July, 1787, between the original States and the people and States of the Territory northwest of the river Ohio; excepting so much of said articles as relate to the boundaries of the State therein to be formed: *And provided also,* That it shall appear * * * that there are, within the proposed State, not less than 40,000 inhabitants."

29. MISSISSIPPI

(a) *The act of March 1, 1817 (3 Stat. 348–349)*

"SECTION 1. The inhabitants of the western part of the Mississippi Territory be, and they hereby are, authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State government, and to assume such name as they shall deem proper; and the said State, when formed, shall be admitted into the Union upon the same footing with the original States, in all respects whatever."

* * * * *

"SEC. 4. * * * members of the (constitutional) convention * * * when met, shall first determine, * * * whether it be or be not expedient * * to form a constitution * * * and if it be determined to be expedient, the convention shall be, and hereby are, authorized to form a constitution and State government: *Provided,* That the same, when formed, shall be republican, and not repugnant to the principles of the ordinance of the 13th of July, 1787, between the people and States of the territory northwest of the river Ohio, so far as the same has been extended to the said territory by the articles of agreement between the United States and the State of Georgia, or of the Constitution of the United States: * * *."

(b) *The act of December 10, 1817 (43 Stat. 474, 473)*

(From preamble of resolution)

Whereas * * * the people of the western part of the Mississippi Territory * * * did * * * form for themselves a constitution and State government, which constitution and State government so formed, is republican, and in conformity to the principles of the articles of compact between the original States and the people and States in the territory northwest of the river Ohio, passed on the 13th day of July, 1787.

"Resolved * * * the State of Mississippi shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever."

30. INDIANA

(a) *The act of April 19, 1816 (3 Stat. 289–290)*

"SECTION 1. The inhabitants of the territory of Indiana be, and they are hereby authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State government, and to assume such name as they shall deem proper; and the said State, when formed, shall be admitted into the union upon the same footing with the original States, in all respects whatever."

* * * * *

"SEC. 4. * * * members of the (constitutional) convention * * * when met, shall first determine, * * * whether it be, or be not expedient, at that time, to form a constitution and State government * * * *Provided,* That the same, whenever formed, shall be republican, and not repugnant to those articles of the ordinance of the 13th of July, 1787, which are declared to be irrevocable between the original States, and the people and States of the territory northwest of the river Ohio; excepting so much of said articles as relate to the boundaries of the States therein to be formed."

* * * * *

(b) *The act of December 11, 1816 (3 Stat.) 399–400*

(From preamble of resolution)

"Whereas * * * the people of said territory did * * * form for themselves a constitution and State government, which constitution and State government, so formed, is republican, and in conformity with the principles of the articles of compact between the original States and the people and States in the territory northwest of the river Ohio, passed on the 13th day of July, 1787.

"SECTION 1. *Resolved,* The State of Indiana shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever."

31. LOUISIANA

The act of February 20, 1811 (2 Stat. 641–643)

"SECTION 1. The inhabitants of that part of the territory or country ceded under the name of Louisiana, by the treaty made at Paris on the 13th day of April, 1803, between the United States and France * * * be, and they are hereby authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State government and to assume such name as they deem proper, under the provisions and upon the conditions hereinafter mentioned."

* * * * *

"SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted,* That in case the (constitutional) convention shall declare its assent, in behalf of the people of said Territory, to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, and shall form a constitution and state government for the people of said Territory of Orleans, the said convention, as soon thereafter as may be, is hereby required to cause to be transmitted to Congress the instrument, by which its assent to the Constitution of the United States is thus given and declared, and also a true and attested copy of such constitution or frame of State government, as shall be formed and provided by said convention, and if the same shall not be disapproved by Congress, at their next session after the receipt thereof, the said State shall be admitted into the Union, upon the same footing with the original States."

* * * * *

"SEC. 3. * * * members of the (constitutional) convention * * * when met, shall first determine * * * whether it be expedient or not, at that time, to form a constitution and State government, for the people of said Territory: *Provided,* That the constitution to be formed, in virtue of the authority herein given, shall be republican, and consistent with the Constitution of the United States; that it shall contain the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty * * *;" (further stipulated requirements as to language, habeas corpus, etc.).

32. OHIO

(a) *The act of April 30, 1802 (2 Stat. 173–174)*

"SECTION 1. The inhabitants of the eastern division of the Territory northwest of the river Ohio, be, and they are hereby authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State government, and to assume such name as they shall deem proper, and the said State, when formed, shall be admitted into the Union, upon the same footing with the original States, in all respects whatever."

* * * * *

"SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted,* That the members of the (constitutional) convention * * * shall form for the people of said State, a constitution and State government; *provided* the same shall be republican, and not repugnant to the ordinance of the 13th of July 1787, between the original States and the people and States of the territory northwest of the river Ohio."

* * * * *

(b) *The act of February 19, 1803 (2 Stat. 201)*

(From preamble of the act

"Whereas, the people of the eastern division of the territory northwest of the river Ohio, did (on November 29, 1802) * * * form for themselves a constitution and State government, and did give to the said State the name of the 'State of Ohio' * * * whereby the said State has become one of the United States of America; * * *."

* * * * *

"SECTION 1. All the laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect with the said State of Ohio, as elsewhere within the United States."

(c) *The act of August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 407)*

"Whereas, in pursuance of an act of Congress, passed on the 30th day of April 1802, entitled 'An act to enable the people of the eastern division of the territory northwest of the river Ohio to form a constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, and for other purposes,' the people of the said territory did, on the 29th day of November 1802, by a convention called for that purpose, form for themselves a constitution and State government, which constitution and State government, so formed is republican, and in conformity to the principles of the articles of compact between the original States and the people and States in the territory northwest of the river Ohio, passed on the 13th day of July 1787: "Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the State of Ohio, shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and is admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever.

"SEC. 2. This joint resolution shall take effect as of March 1, 1803."

33. TENNESSEE

The act of June 1, 1796 (1 Stat. 491–492)

(From preamble)

"Whereas by the acceptance of the deed of cession of the site of North Carolina, Congress are bound to lay out into one or more States, the Territory thereby ceded to the United States:

"Be it enacted, etc.: The whole of the territory ceded to the United States by the State of North Carolina, shall be one State, and the same is hereby declared to be one of the United States of America, on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever, by the name and title of the State of Tennessee. That until the next general census, the said State of Tennessee shall be entitled to one Representative in the House of Representatives of the United States; and in all other respects, as far as they may be applicable, the laws of the United States shall extend to, and have force in the State of Tennessee, in the same manner, as if that State had originally been one of the United States."

34. VERMONT

The act of February 18, 1791 (1 Stat. 191)

(In its entirety)

The State of Vermont having petitioned the Congress to be admitted a member of the United States, *Be it enacted (etc.)*

"On the 4th day of March, 1791, the said State, by the name and style of 'The State of Vermont,' shall be received and admitted into the Union, as a new and entire member of the United States of America."

35. KENTUCKY

(*The act of February 4, 1791 (Stat. 189)*)

(From preamble of act)

"Whereas the legislature of the commonwealth of Virginia, by an act entitled 'An act concerning the erection of the district of Kentucky into an independent State,' passed the 18th day of December, 1789, have consented, that the district of Kentucky, within the jurisdiction of the said commonwealth, and according to its actual boundaries at the time of passing the act aforesaid, should be formed into a new State: And whereas a convention of delegates, chosen by the people of the said district of Kentucky, have petitioned Congress to consent, that, on the 1st day of June, 1792, the said district should be formed into a new State, and received into the Union, by the name of 'The State of Kentucky.'

"SECTION 1. The Congress doth consent, that the said district of Kentucky, within the jurisdiction of commonwealth of Virginia * * * shall, upon the 1st day of June, 1792, be formed into a new State, separate from and independent of, said commonwealth of Virginia.

"SEC. 2. And be it further enacted and declared, that upon the aforesaid 1st day of June, 1792, the said new State, by the name and style of the State of Kentucky, shall be received and admitted into this Union, as a new and entire member of the United States of America."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is an abundance of clearly evident justification for admitting Alaska to the Union of States, while there are but few if any, truly valid arguments against such a course.

The same arguments which are being used in opposing the admission of Alaska to the Union were made against admitting many of our great States. However, it soon became evident that the admission of these States to the Union made us a stronger member of the world of nations.

It is not my intention at this time to discuss the details of Alaska's plea for statehood. In my own opinion the merits have already been established and, I trust, well known by a majority of the Members of this House.

As my colleagues know, I am from one of the southernmost States of the Union, the State of Louisiana. I believe that 90 percent of those whom I have the honor to represent in the Congress would support my petition to the cause for statehood for Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I am fresh from a meeting of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations now *handling* our leaders' request for funds for some 70 of the other 86 nations of the world, I think it is appropriate to mention at this time the assistance we have rendered in helping to create new nations. Is it not true that the record is abundantly clear that this great country of yours and mine has helped to create and bring into being a total of 22 new nations since the end of World War II?

In this year's budget there are requests for tens of millions of dollars for the support of these nations which we are pledged to support with our life and resources.

Mr. Chairman, can we, in good conscience, continue to help bring into being new and fully independent nations, whose people enjoy first-class citizenship, and decline to do less for our own patriotic fellow Americans in Alaska?

A majority of the American people know that Alaskans are Americans, subject to the laws of our land, taxation, and conscription, yet they are without the same class of citizenship that we enjoy in the 48 States. By denying statehood to Alaska, whose people so well deserve the status afforded Americans by the Constitution, we have surely been showing a poor example of our own democracy at work to the remainder of the free world, and especially to the new nations which we have been instrumental in creating and are presently supporting politically, economically, and militarily.

But beyond this, is it not of vital importance to us here in America that we act with justice toward our own fellow Americans in Alaska?

Mr. Chairman, why should not people of the other nations of the world. including leaders as well as the masses, have a right to question our sincerity, our aim, and our doctrine when the record is so abundantly clear that we have not acted with the same justice toward our own fellow Americans in Alaska as toward citizens of other nations?

It has been my honor to represent the Fifth Congressional District of Louisiana in the Congress for 12 years, and I have steadfastly supported statehood for Alaska, and I have confidence that, at this time, the Congress in its wisdom will grant statehood to Alaska, and such an act on the part of the Congress would lessen the suspicion toward this country by many other nations of the world that we are insincere in that the record is clear that we promised to make available our resources or military might to help give them privileges that we deny our fellow Americans in Alaska. It would appear that we should either be consistent with the type of doctrine that we advocate and that, if we cannot be consistent by bringing Alaska into the Union of States, then it would be wise, no doubt, to change our foreign policy—because certainly the two positions presently in force—one treatment to foreign nations; one to our Americans in Alaska—certainly conflict one with the other.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I have been in Alaska many, many times. They are fine, loyal, sincere Americans who deserve immediate statehood.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for yielding, to give me this opportunity to express my personal views.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] for his most effective remarks and to congratulate my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for his hard-hitting, factual speech.

I hope every Member of this House who did not have the opportunity to hear it will read it in tomorrow's RECORD, because no one can read what he has had to say can be longer impressed with these allegations and accusations of giveaway in the bill now before us.

In that connection, may I ask the gentleman just one question. I ask him this because I know he has not been a blind partisan of Alaska statehood. He has insisted always that facts be developed before he would take a position.

There are reports going around that actually in Alaska there is a considerable Communist influence. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. SAYLOR. I would be happy to comment on that. The reports I have gotten from the Federal Bureau of Investigation are that as far as the Territory of Alaska is concerned, its reputation in regard to communism is better than any one of the 48 States.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is not a rumor rather than an outright statement being made so that Members can hear it? It is just a rumor being circulated around to affect the passage of the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, statehood is not, should not, and cannot be a partisan issue.

Never before has the cause of statehood for these two great Territories aroused so much public interest. National TV programs have devoted time to exploring the issues involved, national magazines and newspapers from all corners of the Nation have editorialized on the subject. We should have responded to the wishes of the people long ago. The time has passed for high-sounding speeches—we want action.

On March 29 I asked the Members of this body, "How long does it take the Congress to respond to the will of the people?" A recent Gallup poll showed that the people of this Nation want Alaska admitted as a State by a margin of 12 to 1. What more do we need?

You ask who is in favor of statehood. I have been authorized by the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Fred Seaton, to say to the Members of the House that yesterday he had a conference with the President, and President Eisenhower said that he was in favor of H. R. 7999, a bill providing for the admission of Alaska to statehood, in its present form. The Secretary of the Interior is for it, the speaker of the House of Representatives is for it, and both parties have pledged statehood for Alaska in their platforms. The American people, I think, are ahead of Congress.

In closing, let me make this statement: Seventy-three percent of the persons questioned in a recent Gallup poll favored immediate statehood for Alaska. A pledge of statehood is in the political platforms of both parties. The President of the United States and Secretary of the Interior Seaton have spoken earnestly in behalf of statehood. The people of Alaska have voted overwhelmingly for statehood in approving their constitution. Here is a clear instance in which Congress has lagged far behind public opinion.

No new arguments are necessary to justify Alaskan statehood. On grounds of preparation, population, and ability to manage its own affairs, Alaska qualifies fully. Admission of Alaska to the Union would result in no lasting partisan gain to either party; but a successful joint effort would redound greatly to the credit of both parties and to the citizens of the United States in their dealings at home and abroad.

Let the world see that as Americans we practice what we ask others to do.

To grant to all our citizens in incorporated Territories equal rights under our Constitution.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to take this opportunity to join with the Delegate from Alaska in congratulating our good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for his work in behalf of statehood for Alaska. As I know the record of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] on the question of statehood, it is as follows: Ever since the gentleman came from his Congressional District in the State of Pennsylvania to the Congress, he has been one of the most consistent friends Alaska has had, and I might also say that Hawaii has had in their quest for statehood. He has gone about it a little bit differently than many of us have done because he, like the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] has spent hours, weeks, and months

studying the problems. He certainly knows the subject of which he speaks, and I compliment him on the work that he has done in behalf of statehood for Alaska.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. I, too, would like to add my compliments to the gentleman for his very fine statement on this subject. There has been some talk and considerable controversy concerning the question of discrimination in the field of transportation against the Territory of Alaska. I have here a figure showing that the taxpayers of this country have invested in the Alaskan railway a net amount of $130 million. Is there any other State or territory or area of this country that has the benefit of a railroad in which the investment is made solely by the people of this country?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am not able to answer the gentleman's question affirmatively or negatively as to railroads, but I might point this out to the gentleman that this year we have appropriated over $500 million to CAA alone. There is probably no other section under the American flag that has produced so much revenue for the coffers of the Treasury of the United States as has the Territory of Alaska. It was referred to when the original purchase was made as Seward's folly, but it has since developed not to be a matter of folly, but a monument to the real wisdom of that great Secretary of State. I want to say in dollars and cents the Territory of Alaska has produced untold millions of dollars, and if the United States puts back a few dollars into this Territory, we are only returning a little bit of the money that we have taken out of that great Territory.

Mr. PILLION. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. The annual return to the Federal Government from Alaska is in the neighborhood of $45 million a year, and year after year, outside of the defense expenditures, the payments and Federal aid going to Alaska have amounted to more than $100 million a year; is that not true?

Mr. SAYLOR. No; that is not correct. I am sorry to have to disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. In connection with the Alcan Highway which was constructed at a cost of about $95 million without any contributions by Alaska. Is there any other area that has received such treatment?

Mr. SAYLOR. The Alcan Highway was built for military purposes and as a matter of national defense of this country. Certainly, I would not expect anybody to try to charge to the Territory of Alaska the cost of a highway that was built for our national defense and principally across our neighbor to the north of us, Canada.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his very enlightening and forceful statement in support of this legislation. I am in full accord with the statement he has made. I support this legislation and hope the House will adopt the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it can be conceded, I suggest, that the people of Alaska have done everything in their power to prove that they are fit for full citizenship and that their Territory is fit for full statehood in the sistership of the States of our Union. Our problem is to take the generous, affirmative step that only we in the Congress can take—the affirmative action that will admit Alaska.

We cannot seriously believe that the distance from Alaska to the main body of our continental mainland is so great, her land area so remote, that she does not properly fit in. A century and a half ago it was farther, in time from New York to Philadelphia, infinitely farther from Boston to Charleston, than from Alaska to Washington today. Alaska is closer to our heartland than the trans-Appalachian States were to the seaboard States when the first Thirteen granted statehood to Territories of the Middle West. She is closer than California and Oregon, before the transcontinental railroads, at the time those Pacific Coast States were admitted.

A special problem, obviously, exists in regard to the defense of both Alaska and the Nation because of the Territory's location. But when could it be argued that an area became less defensible when her people were admitted to full partnership with other Americans? The bill before us protects the national interest adequately by providing that referendums on lands and reservation must be approved by Alaska's people before statehood can become effective.

There is no partisan issue here, Mr. Chairman. Both party platforms in 1956 urged the Congress to grant statehood. Our people have expressed themselves in public-opinion polls as overwhelmingly in favor of statehood.

Alaska has served an apprenticeship of 91 years. As her spokesmen point out, this is more than twice the average waiting period served in a dependent status by the present States. She has been an organized Territory for 45 years—again more than twice the period of tutelage for the present States.

Her present population of nearly 220,000 is larger than the population of 15 States when they became full members in our Union. She has achieved this growth despite distant control and frequently onerous circumstances that have deprived her of the chance to show what her people could do on their own to attract new population.

Alaska has shown a remarkable capacity to operate stable instruments of government. Her tax system supports the functions of the Territorial Government. She has the social security programs, the educational systems, the mining and development and conservation programs familiar for responsible governments.

Alaska's people have served and died in America's wars, with the bravery and loyalty shown by other Americans. Her per capita contribution of manpower has been above the national average. Alaskans pay all Federal taxes although they do not share proportionately in all the benefits these taxes support in the 48 States. Alaskans have drafted a constitution, by election of delegates and by ratification of the people, that shows her earnestness in seeking to qualify for statehood. They are ready to elect duly chosen members of the Congress when statehood becomes a fact.

Alaska now pays a penalty for the lack of status as a State. She has no control over her fisheries and minerals, her timber and her water power, comparable to that exercised by the States. The land laws that stimulated settlement of the Midwest have been a deterrent to Alaska. She is not equitably represented in our National Government through the privilege of participating in the presidential elections, through spokesmen in the Congress. She cannot elect her own governor.

Alaska has done her part, Mr. Chairman. Now it is time for us to do ours. It should be this 85th Congress, and not some later one, which takes the constructive forward step of voting admittance of Alaska to the Union.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not historically true that millions and millions of dollars in land grants were given to the railroads years ago when the States in the Midwest and the western part of this country were being opened up?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is true.

Mr. CANFIELD. And how many millions of dollars were given no one knows today; is that not correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. No one has any idea of the amount of money given to the railroads when the Congress was interested in opening up the great western areas of our country. No one knows how much money this country gave away to the railroads and the country has prospered because we did that.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] may extend his remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, frankly, most of the thoughts I have on this bill were so ably and thoroughly expressed by my subcommittee chairman [Mr. O'BRIEN] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] that I actually could not use more than 5 minutes without being entirely repetitious.

What is more, I do not think there is a great deal to be added one way or the other.

Perhaps if we were to vote on this bill in the next 5 minutes, the outcome would be little different than it would if every Member took the full time to which he is entitled.

During the long committee hearings on this bill and a rehash of the issue involved over the years, we have all been exposed to nearly every angle.

Certainly every argument of the opponents have been explored and there have been reams of facts and figures of every nature including revenue, population problems and the social and political aspects of it.

I do not infer that many of these points are not effective arguments, nor do I question their merit.

But in the final analysis when the smoke clears away, the basic issue is human rights.

That both parties had this rarely disputed statehood plank in its platform is of less importance than the effect the action of this House will have upon millions of people across the face of the globe.

Here is a vast area, as the size of States go, in the center of our northernmost perimeter of defense, an area with a tremendous potential in both human and natural resources.

It is a stepchild which we as a nation are normally obliged to adopt.

The gentleman from Oklahoma yesterday recalled that the original colonists engaged in a revolution 182 years ago as a protest against taxation without representation.

I am not prepared to believe that taxation without representation is less reprehensible today than it was at that time.

If anything, the words should ring more clearly and strongly now.

For all practical purposes the people of Alaska are citizens of the United States.

They are taxpayers of the United States as you and I.

They are expected to abide by the laws of the United States and to serve in the Armed Forces to defend our country against all enemies and they are second-class citizens only because their delegate has only a voice in this House without a vote to back it up.

And in the other body they have neither voice nor vote.

No population deficiency makes this situation morally right.

As for any conflict over resources, we must remember that when the people of any State do well, or enjoy the benefits of those resources, the United States as a whole is the beneficiary, too.

Here, I believe, is an opportunity to show in deed the spirit of America which we have failed to sell through costly and frequently unproductive foreign aid projects.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote for the passage of legislation which would enable Alaska to become a State of the Union. This represents a change in my thinking since only a few years ago I voted against similar legislation in the House. Further study of this matter, however, has convinced me that my position was incorrect at that time.

Statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska is strongly supported throughout my Congressional District. In my annual Congressional poll for 1956 the question was asked whether Hawaii and Alaska should both be admitted as States and 70.6 percent of those replying answered in the affirmative. Only 9.9 percent were opposed and 19.5 percent had no opinion. It is also well to recall that the 1956 Republican platform adopted at San Francisco stated unanimously: "We pledge immediate statehood for Alaska recognizing the fact that adequate provision for defense requirements must be made * * *." On the basis that Alaska is now ready for statehood and that taxation without representation is historically unfair and un-American, mail from my district has run about three to one in favor of Alaskan statehood.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to recall that the practice followed by the citizens of Alaska in writing their own State constitution and electing certain provisional officers under it, was the same procedure used by other States in seeking admission to the Union, including my own State of Michigan. At that time, the population of Michigan was roughly 200,000, which is slightly smaller than the presently estimated population of Alaska.

The historic tests for admission to statehood are usually these: (1) That the people of the proposed State are supporters and adherents of democracy and our American way of life; (2) that a majority of the voting population desire statehood; and (3) that the new State's population and resources are such as to be able to support State government and not to be a financial burden on the Federal Government. Without going into detail, Mr. Chairman, information has been furnished me that convinces me that Alaska qualifies for statehood in all three respects. I am, therefore, happy to support this legislation for Alaskan statehood at this time and hope that similar legislation concerning Hawaii will be approved in the near future.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 71]

Allen, Calif.	Clark	Farbstein
Auchincloss	Collier	Fino
Barden	Colmer	Fisher
Bass, Tenn.	Coudert	Granahan
Bates	Curtis, Mass.	Grant
Belcher	Dawson, Ill.	Gregory
Blatnik	Dellay	Gross
Bonner	Dent	Gubser
Boykin	Dies	Haskell
Brooks, La.	Dowdy	Hays, Ark.
Buckley	Durham	Holifield
Burdick	Eberharter	Jarman
Byrnes, Wis.	Edmondson	Jenkins
Carnahan	Engle	Kearney
Christopher	Evins	Kluczynski
Knox	O'Hara, Minn.	Smith, Miss.
Knutson	Powell	Spence
Krueger	Prouty	Steed
Laird	Radwan	Teller
Lennon	Riley	Trimble
Lesinski	Robeson, Va.	Van Pelt
Libonati	Scott, N. C.	Watts
McCarthy	Sheppard	Westland
Machrowicz	Shuford	Willis
Magnuson	Sieminski	Withrow
Morris	Siler	Zelenko

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7999, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 336 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to preface my remarks this afternoon by saying that I do not come here to engage in attacking any personalities. I have known many people from Alaska, I have known many people from Hawaii and many other territorial possessions of this country. I am sure there are Communists in those places, but it has never been my misfortune to meet one of them. The folks I have met have all been good people. I want it distinctly understood that whatever I may say here this afternoon is not intended as an aspersion on any individual who is a patriotic American citizen residing in any of the Territories.

I want to pay especial tribute to the Delegate, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], for the fine service he has rendered in this Congress in representing that great Territory, the fine work he has done on the committee. I have watched him with great diligence many times, and he has come through every time in splendid fashion. He is a fine gentleman, and certainly a scholar on legislative matters having to do with the Territory he represents here in the Nation's Congress.

I also want to pay tribute to my good friend, JOHN BURNS, who represents the Territory of Hawaii. It may be said that Hawaii is not before the House this afternoon, but we will take up that question just a little later. At present I want to pay tribute to JOHN BURNS because he has done a wonderful job for Hawaii. I have watched him on the committee and it has been my pleasure to serve with him. He has done an outstanding job, and I am sure the people of Hawaii are proud of him.

I also want to pay tribute to another good friend of mine from Alaska in the person of ex-Governor Gruening, who has done such an outstanding job in working for this particular piece of legislation. He is one of the most patient men I have ever known. He is a grand fellow and a man who tries to reason. He wrote a wonderful book on Alaska and I hope everyone gets a chance to read it.

These are all fine people, and the other people I have known in Alaska and Hawaii are fine people. They have done good jobs in what they have set out to do. But we are not here this afternoon, nor were we here yesterday nor will we be here next week to change the political situation in which this country stands because some person is a nice fellow. If that had been the purpose of this Congress there would have been many changes made in the past in our political history.

I want to try this afternoon to clarify some situations that I think are terribly confused. In the first place, there seems to be a general opinion that when a person introduces a bill in the National Congress for admission of a Territory to statehood the premise from which you should begin is that that bill should pass without any opposition, that no one should say anything about it, and that it should not even be questioned. That no person should be required to prove what is in the bill he is asking this Congress to pass. They simply take the position that the bill has been introduced, therefore it is a good bill and it ought to pass.

I want to go into it a little bit further in what I have to say as to the attitude of so many people taking the position that the premise from which you start is that Alaska or Hawaii or whatever Territory is before this House should be admitted to statehood unless some people can dig up some facts that would prove it should not be admitted to statehood. I think that is the wrong procedure. I think that the people who advocate statehood should make the case by not only a preponderance of the evidence but by evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, because we are tampering with the political welfare of the country, and I use "political" in its true sense, in the science-of-government sense, not in the political party sense. I think the people who are interested in the political welfare of this country should weigh these matters very carefully. I want to say before I go on that the people who have supported Alaskan statehood and those who have supported Hawaiian statehood are people for whom I have the deepest respect. We argued and fought in committee about this. We had some good times and we had some bad times in committee, but I have the deepest respect for all the people and I am not here to cast aspersions on any Member of this body. I think they are all devoted to what they are trying to do. I think they are all dedicated to the welfare of this Nation. They are doing what they think is right and I hope what I have to say this afternoon will cause some of them to read further than I think they have read so far.

The first thing I want to do is to find out from where we start. First, there has been speech after speech made on the floor of this House in which they have quoted every authority in the world from the President of the United States to the statements made in the political platforms of the parties. They have gone to the Supreme Court. They have gone every place else for authority as to why Alaska should be admitted as a State. I want a little later on to ask some of the ardent proponents of statehood, and they are ardent, to give me the reasons, some of the basic reasons which as yet I have not heard why Alaska should be admitted as a State. But first I want to treat this situation to find out who it is that has the responsibility of saying whether or not Alaska becomes a State. My very dear friend and very able chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday placed this statement:

> Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, Alaska was promised statehood when it was annexed in 1867.
>
> The promise was clear and explicit.
>
> It is found in article III of the treaty with Russia signed March 30, 1867, by Secretary of State William H. Seward and ratified by the United States Senate.
>
> Article III reads as follows:
>
> "The inhabitants of the ceded Territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within 3 years; but if they should prefer to remain in the ceded Territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion. The uncivilized tribes will be subject to such laws and regulations as the United States may, from time to time, adopt in regard to aboriginal tribes of that country."
>
> The essence of that pledge is contained in the word "the inhabitants shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States."

Mind you, that was a treaty that was ratified by the United States Senate. Now you do not have to be here long in the House of Representatives before you find out that we do not have very much to do with treaties. In fact, we do not have anything to do with treaties unless we can adopt some method of passing a statute which might circumvent something we did not like in a treaty. That is questionable procedure. I would not like to see it come before the present Supreme Court because I am afraid that the treaty itself would supersede anything that this House did. But be that as it may, let us go back to the Constitution and find out who is charged with the responsibility of admitting a State to the Union. The Constitution of United States does not specify what conditions must be met to qualify a territory for statehood. Article IV, section 3 states simply:

> New States may be admitted by the Congress into the Union.

The Supreme Court can talk all it wants to about admitting States to the Union, but the fact is that the responsibility for admitting a State or refusing a State admission to the United States of America rests on the shoulders of this body right here, and we cannot discharge it by saying something that the Supreme Court said or something that the other body said in ratifying a treaty that was entered into by a Secretary of State. The obligation is ours, and it is our duty to stand up to it, to face it, and to know and understand what we are doing when we pass a bill of this kind.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Assuming that the Supreme Court would say that treaty supersedes any statute that we pass, just how would the Court go about admitting a State?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Would the gentleman state that again, please?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Assuming that the Supreme Court said that a treaty superseded any statute or was superior to any statute which the Congress passed, how would the Court go about getting a territory in?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I think the answer would simply be that it could almost be done by Presidential directive. That is the reason I am afraid to let it go to the Court, because if it so decided, then a treaty should be entered into permitting a State to come in, and then if the other body ratified that treaty I do not know how we would get them out.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But with what nation could we enter into a treaty which would make necessary that territory to become a State?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It would be with the nation from which we acquired the territory itself, as far as I know.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You mean a treaty with the territory?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No, the nation from which we get the territory.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, no.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I have been trying to follow the gentleman as carefully as possible. Is it his contention that we should ignore Supreme Court decisions and other matters, including treaties, and that we should rest solely upon the right of Congress to admit or not admit new States? Is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes, insofar as statehood is concerned I do not think we can discharge our obligation by permitting other people to make these decisions for us. This is an obligation that rests squarely on our shoulders, and there is no provision that whatever precedent might have been established under other fact situations by other persons or organizations are supposed to be binding upon us.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I agree very thoroughly with the gentleman. I do not believe any treaty which has been made or any court decision which has been made compels us to admit any territory to statehood. I believe the gentleman is correct when he says that the decision rests entirely with Congress, and that is the decision we are attempting to reach here as readily as possible.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am sure the gentleman agrees with me that since it does rest upon our shoulders every Member of this House ought to thoroughly understand what we are doing before we change the political situation that this country is in.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I believe that the House should thoroughly understand. That is why I was hoping that

we would have more opportunity to debate this great question than we have had so far.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Well, I am sorry. Has the gentleman been denied time for debate?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I have not been denied time, but I note that we have spent a great deal of time on matters other than the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I will confine myself to the bill as much as possible.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let us assume the ridiculous situation that we entered into a treaty with Mexico providing in that treaty that Alaska should be given statehood. Would the gentleman contend that it should be admitted as a State and that if Congress did not do it, the Supreme Court could issue a mandatory injunction requiring us to vote affirmatively to admit Alaska?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am sorry; I did not understand the gentleman's question a minute ago. If we entered into a treaty with another country and that treaty contained such a provision and the Supreme Court passing upon it should say that the treaty was superior, then it would be an obligation.

If you follow that sort of thinking we would be obligated to pass an act simply because the Secretary of State said that is what ought to be done.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then assuming that we did not do it, would not enact proper legislation, could the Supreme Court by a mandatory injunction require us to act?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am sorry, sir, but I could not speak for the Supreme Court. I thought I had spoken in keeping with their thinking several times before, but they changed on me in the middle of the stream. I would be glad to refer your question to the Supreme Court for a proper answer.

But let us go on to the argument of those who have said that we are pledged to bring Alaska in. I do not think that anyone in this country or anywhere else has the right or the power to pledge a committee or Members of this Congress except the people that the Member represents in his home district.

We are told, and it came up on the floor of this House the last time this bill was being debated; I believe it was the Alaskan-Hawaiian bill which was being debated—as to what the great political parties had said in their platforms. It is true they did tell us that they were for statehood for these Territories, and I want to read to you what they said, because at that time the question was asked why that was not a pledge. I think at that time I said in effect that party platforms like other political matters were sometimes written to get votes. I was castigated in the press for saying that—being realistic, I might say, about it.

They said: "Oh, no; there is nothing political about this." That may be true. Maybe it was not put in the platforms to get votes; maybe it was put in the platforms to keep from losing certain votes. I do not know whether it was or not, but I want to read what those platforms said.

The 1956 platform of the Democratic Party said—

> We condemn the Republican administration for its utter disregard for the rights to statehood of both Alaska and Hawaii. These territories have contributed greatly to our national economy and cultural life, and are vital to our defense. They are a part of America and should be recognized as such.
>
> We of the Democratic Party, therefore, pledge immediate statehood for these two Territories. We commend these Territories for the action their people have taken in the adoption of constitutions which will become effective forthwith when they are admitted to the Union.

Now, there is not anything wishy-washy about that statement at all. I think it is a hard and clear statement. Of course it does have a little political tinge to it; and I think the Republican one did too, even though it was not quite as straightforward.

The 1956 Republican platform said:

> We pledge immediate statehood for Alaska, recognizing the fact that adequate provision for defense requirements must be made.

Now, you see, they conditioned that on the defense aspect of it, and there is not anyone in this Chamber who does not know that defense sometimes constitutes very good political speech material.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. In just a moment. Reading further:

> We pledge immediate statehood for Hawaii.

Without any qualification.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What I wanted to ask the gentleman, the bill presently before us takes into consideration the defense needs of Alaska?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes. As I understand, it does.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I will be happy to.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman will recall General Twining's testimony before the committee in which he said that they were having no trouble or difficulty at present in the administration of the defense effort in Alaska and that statehood would not in any way help that defense effort.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Well, may I say to the gentleman from New York, who made such a wonderful presentation prior to mine, the defense situation to me—and I believe it was testified to in the hearings—is a matter that is not primarily concerned with statehood. As a matter of fact, I think a much better case can be made out for the defense of this country if you take a territory in a territorial status rather than in a statehood status, especially against the enemy with which we are faced at the present time.

Mr. PILLION. In connection with the defense effort, is the gentleman acquainted with the great concern of the military in the event of a war as to their ability to function in Hawaii in view of the fact that Harry Bridges controls the ILWU union, with a membership of 23,000, the sheriff's department, the transportation workers, and many of our public officials who are members of the United Public Workers Union, which is closely associated with Harry Bridges and his particular Communist apparatus and that in the event of war these unions could very materially obstruct our defense effort? I suppose the gentleman will recall that very recently Mr. Harry Bridges made the remark that in the event of war with the Soviet, he would not be disposed to not strike and have his union members strike in the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I will say this to the gentleman, that the question he has posed is one of the questions that is in my mind and remains in my mind with relation to both statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. So long as that question is in my mind, it would be most difficult for me to conscientiously vote for a situation that could produce another situation that might be detrimental to the welfare of this country.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. May I suggest, in view of the fact that the testimony before our committee was injected into this debate, that it would be most desirable to have the membership know what General Twining did say. I have the material here before me. He was asked the direct question by Mr. BARTLETT:

> Now, General Twining, you testified on this subject in 1950, on the subject of Alaska statehood, before the Senate committee, and you were asked by Senator ANDERSON of New Mexico if you thought statehood would be advantageous.
>
> You said: "Yes; I believe statehood for Alaska would help the military."
>
> May I ask you, General Twining, if that is your thought today?
>
> General TWINING. I believe it would; yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Well, let me say this. At the time that testimony was given, was it not the McKay Line that he had in mind; certain Federal installations?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Well, he might have had many things in mind, but he was not testifying specifically upon the so-called McKay Line. He was testifying on the whole subject of statehood for Alaska, and he said specifically, categorically, any way you want to phrase it, that it would help the military. And that is one of the most vital military outposts that the United States has and a very loyal people all around it, in spite of Harry Bridges in Hawaii.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I have great respect for the gentleman from New York and his opinion, but I think if he would review the record, he would find that at the time General Twining was testifying his testimony was somewhat tempered by some recommendations that had been made by the administration, that would have given the

Defense Department some opportunity or advantage up there that I doubt they should have had.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Going back to the two platforms from which the gentleman quoted, it runs through my mind that the platform of the so-called Republican Party was written, dominated, and controlled by modern Republicans, which does not bind me because I am not one. And the platform for the Democratic Party was written by northern New Deal Democrats mainly. And I do not see how that could bind a real Jeffersonian Democrat. So I do not feel bound by either platform.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will say this to the gentleman, I do not know who wrote the platforms and, as I said before, I am not going to condemn anyone. I was not consulted about them, but if I had been I would have objected to that language being included.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. I would like to read these two sentences from page 120 of the hearings:

Mr. PILLION. If there are no particular difficulties at the present time, would statehood be of any particular advantage then to the military in the administration of its duties and responsibilities in that area?

General TWINING. No particular advantages as far as military operations per se are concerned.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. General Twining is being quoted rather freely and somewhat out of context. I think the RECORD should show what he said at the very outset of his testimony when he was testifying on statehood. He said:

As students of the history of bills favoring statehood for Alaska are aware, I testified in 1950 that I, personally, was in favor of statehood. At that time I was commander in chief of the Alaskan Command and I spoke only on the general proposition of statehood, as distinct from the specific provisions of any Alaskan bill, as such. My personal views that statehood should be granted when the time was ripe have never changed. I am happy, therefore, to be able to say in my official capacity, in this month of March 1957, that, in my opinion, the time is ripe for Alaska to become a State.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the gentleman will bear with me, that is exactly the point that I am making. As we agreed before, this is a matter that should be thoroughly understood by every Member of this House. We all have great respect for General Twining who has made such a fine military record in this country. Under those circumstances, the conflict in the testimony that has been brought out produces the very result I was talking about, or it should produce that result; that is, that this bill certainly needs to be studied, the testimony should be studied by all Members of this House in order to understand exactly where we are and where we are going, because I am afraid that as much as many of them think they do know, they really do not.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield further.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Would the gentleman suggest that we study it for another 42 years?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No; 22 would suit me.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my dear friend from Texas this question. I must say that I have read the bill very carefully and looked for the word "Hawaii" in this bill. I have heard a great deal of debate on this floor about Hawaii in connection with this bill. I was wondering if the gentleman, or any other Member of this body, would explain just what the significance of Hawaii is in the question of the consideration of a bill for statehood for Alaska, when the word "Hawaii" does not appear anywhere in the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am very happy to treat that. I was intending to in just a moment. My good friend has anticipated that situation.

I like to face these things realistically. Of course we know that the reason Alaska and Hawaii were not tied together is that there were some people who were afraid it would defeat both Territories. I know there is no politics tied to this thing, yet you wait from one year to the next and you wonder which side of the political fence each Territory might be on. So what has been done is this: The Alaska bill has been brought up before this House as a separate bill. If anyone in this House is naive enough to think that Hawaii is not next I wish he would stand up and tell me why, because there has not been one argument in this entire debate, there was not one argument presented in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support—or not in support, to tear down the arguments against statehood. There was not anything in support of it. The arguments that were in support of statehood were arguments actually to tear down arguments against statehood. There was not one of those arguments that you could not use to support the admission to statehood of any Territory of the United States of America, including the trust islands; and if you pass this bill and do not admit them, you are guilty of discrimination.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to thank the gentleman for the splendid statement he is making. He has brought up a matter that I think gives me my chief concern about this bill. As I understand it, for the first time in the history of America it is proposed that we take in a State that is separated from America not just by land but by a foreign country. For the first time in America we are going across Canada. This idea about how close we are from the standpoint of jet airplanes, this idea that the other States in the Union were not contiguous, I do not think is particularly relevant. We are going across a foreign country to take in a State.

Then does the gentleman believe that would establish a precedent, so that in another year or perhaps later on this year the fine people of Hawaii might say, "You have established your precedent. We are 4,000 miles, or however many miles we are, out in the Pacific, but now that you have established this precedent you should grant us statehood." Does the gentleman believe that?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I think the gentleman from Florida has made an excellent contribution to this debate. I think he has brought out a point that I intend to treat later, but it is a point that is one of the essentials that ought to be considered. It ought to be considered and evaluated every way in the world before any move is made to move from the shores of the United States of America in taking in another State.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Would the gentleman say this might establish a precedent not only for the addition of Hawaii but Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands?

May I just say one other thing: We had a colleague here a couple of years ago who very frankly said he would be for Puerto Rico because it was the impulse of history. I just wonder if the gentleman thinks this might not create a precedent for many of us to have these waves of the future, these impulses of history, and perhaps be a little careless in getting more States into the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It would be most difficult to deny statehood to any Territory of this country; as a matter of fact, it would be difficult to deny statehood to any place thereafter once you broke that barrier.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Mrs. BLITCH. I wonder if the gentleman would mind if I went back a little bit into the colloquy he had a few minutes ago with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], who referred to the fact that the platforms of both national parties had included planks for Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me so that I may state for the RECORD that I was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention, and also served on the platform and resolutions committee. When this particular subject was brought up at any time during our discussions and came to a vote, my vote was always registered as "no". May I add that when the platform of the platform and resolutions committee was

adopted by the Democratic National Convention, I also voted against the whole platform. I just want that to be in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues in the House.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WHITENER. In connection with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] I would like to call to their attention some of the thoughts expressed by one of the greatest thinkers, I believe, in American history when this matter was before the Congress some years back. He wrote several letters, one of which will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 3, page 3833. Along the same line there is a letter which I would like to quote in part, written by him on July 15, 1947, to the editor of the New York Times. I speak of Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler who certainly is not one whose thinking could not be accepted by most of us. He said in part as follows:

> I am greatly distressed at the progress being made in Congress toward the admission of Hawaii to statehood and the like action contemplated, first, for Alaska, and then, for Puerto Rico.
>
> It is my judgment that to admit one or more of these distant Territories to statehood would be the beginning of the end of our historic United States of America. We should soon be pressed to admit the Philippine Islands, Cuba, and possibly even Australia.
>
> We now have a solid and compact territorial nation bounded by the two great oceans, by Canada, and by Mexico. This should remain so for all time.
>
> It would be grotesque to put territory lying between two and three thousand miles away on the same planes in our Federal Government as Massachusetts, or New York, or Illinois, or California, or Texas, or Virginia.
>
> My own suggestion is that we should set up these three outlying Territories as independent nations by definite diplomatic action. Their independence should have only two conditions: First, their relations with foreign powers should be subject to the approval of the President of the United States and the Senate. This would prevent any foreign power from using them to our disadvantage. Second, litigants in any of these three Territories should have the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. Such action would tend to build up a uniform system of public and civil law in this part of the world. * * *
>
> I earnestly believe it is not too late to prevent this dreadful mistake from being made.

I would like to point out to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that the only difference in the situation now and when this letter was written by that great scholar, Dr. Butler, is that they have now moved Alaska into the batter's box and they have Hawaii on deck, whereas before they had Hawaii in the batter's box and Alaska on deck.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I followed with a great deal of interest the quotation from that distinguished scholar. I am forced to the conclusion that the gentleman accepts the idea that we should—call it an independent nation if you will—establish a foreign nation out of what is now American soil right next to Siberia. With all due respect to Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, I think that is the worst thing that could happen to the United States.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am sorry I do not get the connection about establishing a foreign nation because I think Alaska has been a very patriotic Territory. I think the people there have followed along with the United States in a wonderful fashion. I am very proud of Alaska and very proud of the people up there.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I know the gentleman is, but the suggestion which was just made to the gentleman was that an independent nation was created. That would make foreigners out of Americans. There would be no other description of it.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Well, that might be true. Of course we are in that same situation as far as Canada is concerned.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. But you want to spread that up to the borders of Siberia.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Oh, no. That was Dr. Butler talking.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I was doing my best to answer Dr. Butler.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I have great respect for Dr. Butler, but I do not agree with him on every minute point. That is one we would need to discuss.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. I think the colloquy regarding Dr. Butler has wandered afield from that by which it can be viewed. I do not think he was talking about establishing any foreign nation as such, but I think perhaps he had in mind where noncontiguous territories have been regarded as part and parcel of the mainland, and we all know that that experiment has failed very miserably. I think that is the concept of political science that Dr. Butler has in mind, and I think it points up to us whenever we enter this area of noncontiguity that, historically speaking, wherever it has been experimented with in the past it has failed. As a consequence, I believe that one of our major concerns in this legislation is with that exact point.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Referring to the comment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], had his criterion been applied, for example, to the State of California, the State of California might not have been admitted to the United States, or might have been admitted to the United States much later, because then the United States was separated by what was reported to be about 1,500 or 2,000 miles from the then Republic of Mexico.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I want to commend the gentleman. His thinking is right along the line of that of the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK], but with which I do not agree.

Mr. DINGELL. If I may also ask the gentleman to yield further, I would like to point out that each piece of legislation ought to stand on its own merits. The question of the admission of a State to this Union ought to stand on its own merits the same as any other piece of legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is exactly correct. And while we are on that, we have a bill that is before the House, and when the Members all understand it, they will find that there are about 20 pieces of legislation, and I am very conservative when I say that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made the remark a minute ago that our great President said he was for this bill, and that it ought to be passed just like it is. I was encouraged to find out that our great President knew what was in the bill, but alarmed that he was for it as written. The committee expects to make several changes in it.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to avoid commenting on what the President knows about this bill. I think we ought to legislate here with regard to Alaska and not with regard to what our prejudices may be on the subject of Hawaii or Puerto Rico. I happen to think that the people of Puerto Rico are in a good position and they do not want to come into the Union as a State. They are getting some pretty tremendous tax advantages out of their present situation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The gentleman has much more knowledge than I do about that subject, because it has been my impression there are a lot of territories that would like to become a State. But I appreciate the gentleman's information and I will consider it in voting on this legislation.

Mr. BARTLETT. I wonder if we might go back to the treaty of cession which the gentleman mentioned. He referred to the language in somewhat these words:

> The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States—

And so forth. Do I understand the gentleman correctly to say that this body did not have an opportunity to pass on that?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Will the gentleman repeat his question?

Mr. BARTLETT. Did I understand the gentleman correctly? Did the gentleman say that this body, this House of Representatives, never had any opportunity to pass upon that language in any form?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. On that treaty; we did not pass on that treaty. The treaty was cited by our distinguished chairman as one of the reasons why we should, just as the Gallup polls have been cited by other Members.

Mr. BARTLETT. Actually, however, history records the fact that this very treaty for a very curious reason was passed upon by the House of Represent-

atives; it did not have to be, in a constitutional sense, but the treaty was brought before the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I cannot take notice of the extracurricular activities of a body back in those days which may not have been apprised of what the Constitution provided and did not realize that they were not supposed to handle treaties.

Mr. BARTLETT. I dislike to have the gentleman use such a statement, because Russia might think, it being so long ago, that we were not entitled to Alaska. The House appropriated money, of course, for the payment for Alaska.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am sure that if Russia attempted to take Alaska, that Alaskans and people all over the United States would rush to her defense. I would be glad to enlist my services now for her defense in time of war.

Mr. BARTLETT. And should the time ever come that any country tried to invade Texas, Alaska would go down to help her.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I had wanted to ask the gentleman a question or two. I do not know what there has been in the gentleman's speech that is so controversial, but he has certainly aroused more interest in this bill than I have seen in the 2 days the debate has thus far proceeded.

I understood the gentleman from Michigan to question whether we ought even to think about these other outlying territories. As a matter of fact, we know that Hawaii was on the list before Alaska, and if we look at things practically, we know that the next thing will be Hawaii, and it will come in this Congress if this bill passes. Now, that will take three Members out of the present representation in the House. Then comes Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico has something over 2 million inhabitants against Alaska's—I say 80,000 bona fide citizens. How can you consistently refuse statehood to Puerto Rico? The conversation to the effect that Puerto Rico does not want statehood does not make much impression on me. I am sure they would like to have statehood, and I do not see how you are going to avoid it or how you are going to get around 2 or 3 more Congressmen being displaced from the present representation. I have worried a good deal about that until I questioned the gentleman from New York, my good friend here, in the Rules Committee about that the other day. He said: "Oh, I will give Alaska my seat in Congress." So that took care of that situation.

Then comes along Hawaii and I think the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] said he would give his seat up to one of these offshore Territories. So that only left one fellow to be worried about, because there would be three; we have two already taken care of. I wonder if the gentleman from Michigan would now agree to give his seat to the third one so that the rest of us may cease to worry about whether our State is going to be reduced in representation?

Then I wonder whether the States that these gentlemen represent and who are so generous are going to be equally generous and willing to give up their representation in the Congress of the United States. Has the gentleman any information on that subject?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the gentleman will permit me, they have not confided in me as to what their future intentions are. But I will say that I have a sneaking suspicion—and I have deep respect for all of them—that they are not in danger of losing their seats in this body.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have a similar suspicion. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, my good friend [Mr. SAYLOR]—and I hope he is here, because he made some allusion in his remarks about a letter I had written to the Members of the House on the 6th of May.

So, I asked him if he would not yield to me, because I wanted to see whether he questioned the accuracy of the statements in that letter. And he said he did, because I had said this was the greatest give-away in the history of the country. And that is the only thing he apparently challenged. Maybe he was right about that because, when you consider the many billions of dollars that we gave away in foreign aid, it may be that that is somewhat larger than this give-away we are making in this bill. But I wanted to question him further as to some of the statements made there and that I called the attention of the House to, and I would like to make it a matter of record now. I made certain statements in that letter. The gentleman from Pennsylvania declined to be questioned on the remarks he made about that letter. Now, I challenge him or anyone else to challenge any statement of fact contained in that letter. Now, here is what I alleged in that letter. I said that there have been explorations in Alaska that disclosed that, of the 33 strategic metals that we need for the defense of this Nation, 31 of them have been discovered in Alaska. I said that, for the first time in the history of statehood in this Nation, that in this bill for statehood we have not reserved to the people of the United States, to whom it belongs, all of the mineral resources in the land that we give to the new State.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Would the gentleman permit me to interject at this point?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If this bill, as it is written, passes, it is entirely possible that a present law will be repealed because there is a savings clause in the last feature that repeals all laws in conflict with it. There is a statute on the books right now that prohibits this Government from transferring lands to States without reserving mineral interests. And this bill could repeal that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman is correct. So this is the first bill that does not specifically reserve. And I have photostatic copies in my file—and I expect to speak on it on Monday—of every statute constituting a State since the Civil War, and they have all reserved. For the first time in the history of this country, this bill specifically grants to the State the mineral rights in every piece of property that they take. Now, then, this bill gives to the State of Alaska one-half of that great Territory, lands that belong to all the people of the United States. One hundred eighty-two million—not thousands, but 182,800,000 acres of land that belongs to your constituents and mine are given to the State of Alaska, and we also give them all of the mineral rights under all of those acres. Now, that is not all. I do not know who wrote this bill, but somebody did a pretty sharp job on it. For the first time in the history of any legislation for statehood, if you will look at the bill, you will find that the State of Alaska is given the right, not for 1 year or 2 years, but for 25 years, to make a selection of those lands, and it is given the right to spot them all over the Territory of Alaska, in areas not less than five-thousand-and-some-hundred acres. Now, what does that mean? That means that for 25 years any of these 33 strategic materials that are discovered in paying quantities the State of Alaska can jump on them, like a chicken on a June bug, and grab up and take unto itself every bit of minerals by making this selection in small spots here and yonder that may be developed in that State. I want to know if there is any Member of this House, Democrat or Republican, who is prepared to go home and tell his people that we have given away property that belongs to them, to this little group of folks up in Alaska, property that has been carried at great expense to the taxpayers of this country for 100 years. Are you prepared to go home and tell your people, "Here, we have given it away"?

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his splendid contribution.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida a minute ago made reference to the situation that has been referred to in past discussions of statehood bills as the noncontinguity theory. Of course, that theory was pooh-poohed by many who were strong supporters of statehood for these Territories. The arguments that are advanced in support of statehood are not arguments or reasons why Territories should be admitted as States to the Union; they are nothing in the world but charges and answers to what was said by the opponents of these bills. In other words, they are reasons why statehood should not be denied to these people. Let us follow that out to its logical conclusion. It would apply to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and to every Territory that we own or in which we have an interest, including the Trust Territories. I venture to say there are a number of people within the sound of my voice who are not familiar with the situation of the Trust Territories and do not realize that there are over 2,000

islands in the Pacific that cover an area about the size of the United States of America, that come within the term Trust Territories. If you are going to say to the people of Alaska, "You are entitled to come in," how are you going to deny statehood to the smallest island that we have, regardless of who lives on it or how many people live on it? There is not any sensible answer. If you say, "You cannot come in," but you take in Alaska or Hawaii, then you are begging the question. You are not being honest with yourself when you do it.

People say this: "Well, the noncontiguity theory is no good." But it is probably the most important factor in this whole situation.

The question was asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] a minute ago concerning the situation when California was taken in. Here is something that must be understood. The territory between the United States of America and California, when California was admitted, was owned by the United States of America. It was property that was owned by us. The contiguity situation alone then would have been sufficient in my mind to have justified statehood for the Territories. But without that contiguity, the Territory should not be admitted. Now you may ask why. I am going to tell you why, briefly. And I wish I had more time to go into this matter. But, to state it as briefly and simply as I can, it is this. Today land and inland waters are the boundary lines between sovereign powers. When you cross a boundary line, you move into the jurisdiction of a foreign nation, and you either violate it, if it is an enemy nation, or you must get permission to cross even if it is a friendly nation. This would be the first time in the history of this country that we would have granted statehood to a Territory that is situated so that you could not get to it without going outside of the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States of America. In order to get to Alaska you must get permission to cross a foreign nation, Canada, or you must cross the high seas.

I implore each of you to weigh this bill and every feature in it, with the greatest scrutiny and care. It's passage could be the beginning of the end of the Republic as we know it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak for Alaskan statehood.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 1 hour or any part thereof.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes; I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, if permissible, I should like to pose a parliamentary inquiry as to the situation tomorrow. I understand we do meet tomorrow, but if there are going to be any quorum calls perhaps the Committee will rise. I wonder if there is any agreement that has been made with the other side. Some of our Members want to get away, to get to New York or to get to their offices and do some work there. May I inquire what the parliamentary situation may be concerning tomorrow and Monday?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets that he is not in a position to anticipate what may happen tomorrow. The gentleman might direct his question to the acting chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As the loyal opposition, I will do that.

Mr. ASPINALL. There is an understanding at the present time that as soon as the Committee of the Whole rises this evening I shall submit a unanimous-consent request that general debate be continued tomorrow and through Monday, closing at 5 o'clock Monday evening, the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]; that tomorrow we shall proceed to debate the bill under general debate, and if we find ourselves without a quorum, because so many of our people have already promised to go away, we shall respect their position and protect them in their rights.

Mr. MARTIN. If the gentleman will yield, do I correctly understand that the Members who are going to handle the time on Monday are both in favor of the legislation?

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand it, the gentleman is correct. However, we have an understanding that the time will be divided absolutely equally between those in favor of and those in opposition to the legislation.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska share in that understanding?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is a proper agreement; yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Nebraska has already promised the acting chairman that he will do that.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman will do the same on his side?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from New York has already made that promise.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Certainly, that would be very definitely understood.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have a duty to perform in this House today and I intend to perform that duty. I represent about 368,000 people in my district in New Jersey. I am prepared to go back to those people and tell them that in this year of 1958 I voted for Alaskan statehood, even as I did in this House in 1950, when the bill was approved by a majority of the membership.

Historically the House has passed the Alaskan statehood bill on 1 occasion, the Senate on 2 occasions. The Senate once recommitted the bill by a margin of 1 vote, the vote being 45 to 44.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday between quorum calls speakers on this bill literally drummed into our ears the idea that voting for Alaskan statehood was repugnant to our American way of life. I do not agree with any such premise. I hold there are many, many American people—yes, people important in American life who disagree. Who does favor Alaskan statehood? The list of those who favor Alaskan statehood, and they should be recapped at this time in the debate, is very impressive. This list starts with the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Alaskan statehood is also favored by his predecessor in office, Harry S. Truman, who urged statehood for Alaska in his first state of the Union message in January, 1946, and repeatedly thereafter.

There is Secretary of the Interior, Fred A. Seaton, the Federal departmental official who—above all others—has responsibilities in and to the Territory of Alaska. Some of these he will relinquish if Alaska, as she hopes it will, becomes a State. I might add that his two immediate predecessors, Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman and his predecessor in turn, Secretary Julius A. Krug, both warmly supported statehood for Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, I might digress here to say that only yesterday 88 students from my Congressional District came to my offices on Capitol Hill. I posed to them this question: How do you students now feel regarding Alaskan statehood which you will hear debated on the very floor of the House of Representatives this afternoon? All 88 were unanimous in speaking out their wishes that the bill be passed.

Mr. Chairman, there is Gen. Nathan F. Twining, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, whose name has been brought into debate this afternoon, whose service from 1947 to 1950 as Commander in Chief of the Alaskan Command made him intimately familiar with the Territory. And it is worth repeating one of his predecessors as Chief of Staff of the Air Force, the late Gen. H. H. "Hap" Arnold, was likewise a strong supporter of statehood for Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, while we are citing five-star supporters of statehood for Alaska, let us include two more—General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz. To these I could also add the name of late Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd, the famous explorer.

Many important national organizations representing the most diverse interests with memberships totaling many millions of Americans have in recent years endorsed statehood for Alaska. These include the United States Chamber of Commerce, an organization of our foremost businessmen. Likewise, the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States—the Jaycees who represent the up and coming youth among the businessmen of America. They, too, strongly endorse statehood for Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, organized labor in our country is as favorable to statehood for Alaska as is organized business. Among those who have endorsed statehood for Alaska are the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations—the AFL–CIO. Another great group representing organized labor are the railway brotherhoods—16 in number. They, too, have endorsed statehood for Alaska.

The patriotic societies—the men who served our country in war—are strongly in favor of statehood for Alaska. Alaskan statehood has been endorsed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, by the American Legion, by the AMVETS, and by the Catholic War Veterans.

Great women's organizations have also endorsed Alaskan statehood.

Few women's organizations stand higher in public esteem, or have a wider distribution of membership than the General Federation of Women's Clubs—with some 5 million active members. They have strongly endorsed statehood for Alaska. Another women's organization which also has, is the Dames of the Loyal Legion.

Statehood has also been endorsed by such diverse organizations as the National Grange, the Association of State Attorneys General, the Congress of Home Missions—representing some 30 Protestant denominations.

Several years ago, the Catholic Bishop of Alaska, the Right Reverend Francis D. Gleeson, authorized the two priests of longest residence in Alaska, to testify at a statehood hearing, which both did—strongly in its favor. The senior of these, the Reverend G. Edgar Gallant, is now vicar general of the Diocese of Juneau, which includes the southern part of Alaska.

Service clubs, the Kiwanis International and the Lions International—and fraternal organizations such as the Loyal Order of Moose, have endorsed statehood for Alaska.

Indeed, no national organization of importance which interested itself in Alaska, has declined to endorse its statehood cause.

The press of the Nation is preponderately for statehood.

The House of Representatives enacted an Alaska statehood bill 8 years ago, on March 5, 1950.

Our House passed the Alaska statehood bill before the decennial census of 1950 was taken. The estimated population at that time was 100,000. That population has more than doubled since.

If the House could enact statehood legislation then, why not now?

Much else has happened since 1950 to make statehood for Alaska even more valid and more urgent than it was 8 years ago.

Since the passage of the Alaska statehood bill by the House in 1950, both the Democratic and Republican platform planks have pledged immediate statehood. It is in both parties' 1956 platforms. That was not the case in 1950.

Since the passage of the Alaska statehood bill by the House in 1950, Alaska's economy has leaped forward with—

First. The establishment of a 500-ton pulp mill in Ketchikan in 1954, the first major utilization of Alaska's vast timber resources.

Second. The construction of a second pulp mill at Sitka, with a 300-ton capacity. Negotiations for two more are in process.

Third. The striking of oil in Alaska and the filing, in the 10 months since that strike, of oil leases on over 30 million acres of Alaska lands.

Since the House enacted the Alaska statehood bill in 1950, the people of Alaska have unmistakably shown their intense desire for statehood by holding a constitutional convention, drafting an excellent constitution, ratifying that constitution by an election of the people, and further adopting the so-called Alaska-Tennessee plan—following the precedents set by Tennessee, Michigan, Iowa, California, Minnesota, Oregon, and Kansas—and electing two Senators and a Representative to come to Washington and plead the cause of statehood.

Since the House voted an Alaska statehood bill in 1950, 8 years have elapsed, extending Alaska's period of pupilage to 91 years—the longest duration of territorialism in our history.

Since the House voted an Alaska statehood bill in 1950, international tension has greatly increased. Colonialism has become an acute worldwide issue, furnishing a potent reason for America to show the world that it practices what it preaches.

Oh, what disillusioning news it would be to the Free World, to the whole world, to hear that the House of Representatives in our great Nation's Capital in this year of 1958, yes, in the month of May, turned down a bill providing for Alaska statehood.

But to return to the long list of those who favor statehood for Alaska.

The most important of those supporters is the American people.

In the last 3 years, a score of polls have been taken in various Congressional Districts by their Representatives. They have all favored statehood—some by overwhelming majorities.

And, finally and quite significantly the Gallup polls taken on the issue of statehood for Alaska, reported—as recently as last March—a vote of 75 percent in favor to 6 percent opposed, or over 12 to 1 for statehood for Alaska.

Yes, the American people want statehood for Alaska.

Just what are we waiting for?

I now yield to my valiant friend from New York [Mr. DOOLEY] who once established a record, an intercollegiate record that has never been beaten, throwing a successful pass for 67 yards, on the football gridiron, this for old Dartmouth.

Mr. DOOLEY. I thank the gentleman for his gracious but very embarrassing introduction.

Mr. CANFIELD. I want the gentleman to throw a pass now for statehood.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of statehood for Alaska. The subject—one of the most important and significant we have yet been called on to face in the 85th Congress, has been thoroughly explored. The admission of a Territory into the Union of States, however, is a momentous event, such that it cannot be dealt with cursorily or casually, but must be weighed carefully on the scales of propriety, equity, and commonsense.

It was Ernest Gruening, Senator-elect from Alaska, who in his testimony before the Committee on Insular Affairs, pointed out that approximately 90 years ago the United States made a specific pledge as to the future of the Territory of Alaska when this Government proclaimed in the treaty of cession signed with Russia, that "the inhabitants of the ceded Territory, according to their choice, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be protected in the full enjoyment of their liberty and sovereignty."

Instead of fulfilling that promise, it is an irrefutable fact that for decades our Government's relationship with Alaska constituted a deplorable succession of shabby dealings, pitiable neglect, and unforgivable apathy to the status of that Territory and the well-being of its residents.

Alaska, to my mind, deserves statehood if any Territory ever did. Purchased in 1867 for the price of 2 cents per acre, Alaska today embraces 375 million acres of land, the mineral worth of which has never been closely evaluated.

But, what is more important, Alaska gives great promise for future importance, more so than most of the 35 Territories admitted to the original Union of States. I say this not only because of Alaska's natural wealth—its minerals, its timber, and its fish—but because it is our great outpost of the northern frontier, the nearest point of our country to the North Pole—the focal point for future air assaults.

The gentleman from New York, Mr. LEO O'BRIEN, delineated for the Members of this body only yesterday the various reasons why Alaska should be granted statehood. He did so eloquently and well. I do not wish to try to embellish his fine and trenchant statement.

Permit me to add, however, that, in addition to the great promise Alaska has of developing into a huge and resourceful area, its military importance cannot be overestimated. Only 54 miles of sea separate Alaska from Siberia. The international boundary, as a matter of fact, runs directly through the waters of Little Diomede Island and Big Diomede Island—which is Russian—in the Bering Strait. And I might recall that Alaska is the only part of the American Continent which suffered actual enemy occupation during World War II.

It is important—even vital—that we bind this Territory to our country by ties of statehood. We do not want Alaska thought of by the rest of the world as a half-American segment isolated and neglected, a partly disowned and wholly disenchanted area which other countries might continue to eye eagerly. Let us nail it down once and for all as a State.

There is definite reluctance on the part of the gentleman from New York to inject into these remarks any mention of Hawaii. Yesterday, however, the distinguished gentleman from New York, my colleague [Mr. PILLION], stated in effect, and I do not quote him verbatim, that Hawaii is under the control of Harry Bridges—the Communist labor leader.

In other words, we should, according to the gentleman to whom I have reference, but for whom I have proper respect, not give consideration to a Territory made up of 500,000 people, because

1 notorious Communist is active in their midst.

It was my privilege to visit Hawaii last fall and it can be said in all fairness that the influence of communism on the islands is generally exaggerated. Most of the dock workers lend lip service to Bridges to retain their jobs.

The islands—a valuable bastion of naval and air strength in the Pacific—the only sizable haven for our ships of the fleet between the Pacific coast and Asia, is filled with people who are loyal Americans.

True, there is a heavy segment of people of Japanese origin, 34 percent to be exact, but they are for the most part good Americans.

When the Nisei regiment which was annihilated in Europe was being reformed, 2,600 men were asked for—some 9,000 volunteered for Uncle Sam—knowing full well they were signing their own death warrants. The people of the islands are proud of their American affiliations, but chagrined—like the people of Alaska—from having had to suffer in the role of second-class citizens for over half a century. The best antidote for Communist inroads in Hawaii is statehood—not apathy and condemnation.

The Representative from New York chided the advocates of Alaskan statehood by pointing out that such statehood would ultimately pave the way for statehood for Hawaii. I ask would that be tragic. Politically, it might be painful to some who do not want the status quo disturbed—who do not want to take the risk of Senators of alien origin entering the high council chambers of our country.

Such an attitude is provincial and unwarranted.

Newspaper polls reflect that sentiment for Alaskan statehood is 12 to 1.

If this great body is to do justice to a group of Americans who have too long been disenfranchised, if we are to bow to the demands of the times, and acknowledge the weight of public acceptance and public sufferance, we will quickly vote Alaska into the Union.

None of the 35 Territories admitted to the Union over the last 100 years has failed to meet the expectations of statehood since its admission. Neither will Alaska.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, some years ago Izvestia or some other prominent newspaper printed in the Soviet Union reportedly carried comment to the effect that the United States of America acquired the Territory of Alaska by fraud and that it should be returned to the Soviet Union. I am having Dr. Griffith of the Legislative Reference Service in the Congressional Library seek a record of that statement. But, I am sure the Delegate from Alaska, the distinguished gentleman now representing the Territory here on the floor this afternoon, recalls that some years ago a statement of that kind was made.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me that the answer to those who say that Alaska cannot afford statehood is that if statehood is granted to Alaska, the heavy hand of bureaucracy and control by the Department of the Interior would be lifted from them and that then Alaska will go forward and will have great development; that private enterprise and private money will come in to develop another great State in this Union?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is the sincere belief of all who favor statehood for Alaska and most certainly that is my strong belief.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I might say that the history of every State that was admitted to the Union is exactly along the lines indicated by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman; and I want to say to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] that I agree with what he has said and that it is my intention to support this bill for statehood for Alaska.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman. I know something about his fairness, his desire to assist others who rightly seek help. He is a crusader for justice.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement. I should like to point out to the Committee that on this question of the amount of land that is to be given to the new States, we must take into consideration the fact that we have a great undeveloped Territory up there that is going to need all of the help that it can get. And we are all concerned in seeing to it that a new State gets off to a good start.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to lend my wholehearted support to the proposition of granting Alaska her hard-won and well-earned statehood. Many of our Western States—Utah among them—are not so many years removed from their own battles to cast off the bonds of territorial status and take their destined place in our great democracy.

Like Alaska, those Territories were faced with the acid test of growing sufficiently to merit statehood under conditions which seemed inspired specifically to discourage that growth. History has shown that the growth may be slow but it is mighty tough, and flourishes in the open sunlight of statehood.

Alaska has met that test. Now is the time to let her begin realizing her true potential.

But if Alaska is to be given the duties and responsibilities of statehood, she must also be given a visible means of support. That 99 percent of Alaska still lies within the public domain speaks for itself of how Federal ownership inhibits the development of natural riches—riches which, incidentally, would benefit all of the United States, not just the State of Alaska. It is to Alaska's everlasting credit and our own never-ending wonderment that she has been able to come as far as she has in Territorial status.

To provide the new State with this base for a going and growing economy, H. R. 7999 proposes—in the well-established tradition which has accompanied all of our westward expansion—to grant some of the public lands to the State to be used and developed by her people.

Mr. Chairman, it is to these public-land features of the bill that I wish to address myself today.

There has been criticism that the land grants are too generous. As the bill now reads, they would total 182,800,000 acres. While even that figure represents only half the public domain in Alaska, I can agree that it is perhaps overly generous, and at the appropriate time an amendment will be offered to reduce the total to 103,350,000 acres. That was the amount asked for in the statehood bills originally introduced into this session of the Congress.

A hundred million acres of land admittedly is still a lot of real estate—it is about the size of the State of California—but we must remember that we are dealing here with a vast area which would make, staggering as the thought may be, two of Texas with enough left over for Florida.

In fact, that 103-million acres would amount to only 28 percent of Alaska, leaving some 70 percent of the total area still under the control of the Federal Government. That happens to be about the same ratio of Federal ownership currently experienced in my own State of Utah, and we in Utah are prepared to testify that it is as much tax-exempt land as the traffic and the taxpayers will bear.

In addition to the virtually complete Federal ownership of present-day Alaska, there are other circumstances necessitating a larger grant than has been the case in admission of other States.

For one thing, in the interests of national defense it is proposed to draw a line through the middle of the State, north and west of which the Federal Government may at any time make massive defense withdrawals and in that area Alaska can choose no lands without the approval of the President or his designated representative. About 45 percent of Alaska lies within that defense area, pretty well limiting Alaska's land selections to the remaining 55 percent.

Further, over 92-million acres—both in and out of the defense area—already have been withdrawn by the Federal Government, and these include much of the most valuable resources. They include, for example, nearly 21-million acres of the best forest lands and nearly 49-million acres of oil and gas reserves.

While Alaska is a land of great potential wealth, we cannot drop the emphasis upon the "potential". By reasons of climate and geography, the develop-

ment must be, if steady, slow and hard. To make the statehood grants meaningful—to accomplish their purpose of giving the State something to grow and to nurture on—the bill offers the new State a chance to select lands of value instead of barren tundras.

If these terms seem generous in comparison with what other States have received, it is for just one good and sufficient reason: They must be more generous if Alaska is to take and retain her place among the States. But that is no argument against Alaskan statehood, because it is a situation which will hold as true 90 years from now unless statehood is granted, as it did 90 years ago. The important point is that Alaska has demonstrated she is ready, if given fair opportunity, to take her place.

These terms to which I refer include the right to select lands known or believed to be mineral in character, and—for the first five years of statehood only—to select lands which may already be under Federal lease for oil, gas, or coal development. All grants include the mineral rights, but these rights must be retained by the State if the lands pass into private ownership. In other words, the mineral rights will always belong to the people of Alaska, and never to private individuals.

It can also be observed that of 29 States containing public lands, only 10 were admitted to the Union with mineral reservations of any kind in their enabling acts.

For the development and expansion of communities, Alaska would be allowed to choose 400,000 acres of vacant and unappropriated national forest lands and another 400,000 acres of vacant, unappropriated and unreserved lands adjacent to established communities or in areas suitable for communities or recreational areas. I intend, incidentally, to amend the time limit for selection from 50 to 25 years.

The bulk of the grant—102,550,000 acres if my amendment is adopted—must be selected from vacant, unappropriated and unreserved public lands within 25 years after statehood. On all of these grants, existing claims, entries, and locations would be fully protected.

As to that lion's share of lands which would remain under Federal control, Alaska would receive—for the support of its public schools—5 percent of the net proceeds from the sale of any land by the Federal Government.

Additionally, Alaska would receive 90 percent of the proceeds from the operation of Government coal mines and from the production of coal, phosphates, oil, oil shale, and sodium from the public domain. Reflecting Alaska's exclusion from the Reclamation Act of 1902, these are the same provisions which this Congress approved—by consent—for the Territory of Alaska last year in Public Law 85–88.

The bill also repeals a 1914 law which withdrew certain coal lands, and thus makes them available to selection and development.

If these provisions are, as charged, a "giveaway of our natural resources", to whom are they being given? They are being given to the people of Alaska, citizens of the United States. How much are they being given? They are being given a little more than one-fourth and somewhat less than one-third of the land which is their home and their livelihood, and which must be opened up if Alaska or any other part of the United States are to reap the benefits of the bargain purchase we made 91 years ago.

These provisions are the foundation upon which Alaska can and will build to the enormous benefit of the national economy shared by her sister States. We cannot make Alaska a "full and equal" State in name and then deny her the wherewithal to realize that status in fact.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sure the gentleman from Utah has visited Alaska even as has the gentleman who is in the well of the House, and I am glad to have his contribution.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I will say that I have been to Alaska on two occasions on statehood hearings. We went to every part of Alaska in considering this problem, and I have had occasion to talk with many people up there as well as in Hawaii. I am thoroughly convinced that statehood is the only solution to the problem that those people are now facing.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is my deep feeling, too.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], for his kindness in yielding to me because, under the rule under which we are now operating, such action gives the opportunity to some of us who have not been recognized, to say a few words on this subject.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my friend that because of his unique background, not only in the House but in life as a whole, I am very anxious to hear his presentation today. Frankly, I do not know whether he is going to speak for or against statehood for Alaska, but I shall doff my hat to him on what he has to offer.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. He has always been very courteous to me during the 15 years we have served together in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to comment for just a moment on the point that the gentleman from Utah, Mr. DAWSON, just brought up. That is as to the type of land in Alaska. It is true that there is land in Alaska which can be lived upon, but I believe the gentleman from Utah will also agree with me—I, too, have flown over the millions of acres in Alaska—that many of these millions of acres are composed of tundra, or inaccessible mountain ranges, which swell the total in terms of acreage; but in terms of habitable and tillable land it would actually not be a true representation.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I would say that is absolutely correct. You need only to go up there to see what the situation is to realize that you cannot possibly compare the situation in Alaska to the situation in this country.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think this is very important. I believe my colleague will agree that when we talk about 180 million acres of land and giving these people a period of time in order to select the land which is suitable for human habitation and development, we realize that there is a tremendous area of this land which cannot be used for that purpose.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Is it not true that if Alaska is given 182 million acres of land, approximately one-half of the total area, actually that will represent 100 percent of the valuable lands because so much of the lands up there are tundra and wasteland; so that when you are giving them one-half of the acreage and permit them 25 years to make their choice, in some instances 50 years to make their choice, you are in effect giving to Alaska 100 percent of the valuable lands in Alaska.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would say that if that be true, I see nothing wrong in our treating the States of our Union equally. When we took in California, when we took in the other different States of the Union, of course we gave to the people of those great States the resources of those States, but we did not thereby lose them from the Union. They became a part of the Union and they were developed and became items of strength in our Union. So it is a great deal different from giving your wife part of your sustenance and keeping it in the family and giving it away to a stranger to be squandered. In anything we do to strengthen Alaska I hope we do not feel that we are losing Alaska. We are merely cementing Alaska to us with the strong bonds of statehood. We are insuring that the people will have the interest and the opportunity to develop those resources, to strengthen the Union, as each State we have added has strengthened the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. May I commend the gentleman from California for his statement. A new State does need sinews.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. It is just like giving a bride a dowry, we are not contemplating supporting her and her husband and the children and grandchildren in perpetuity.

The gentleman from New York overlooked one important factor in this matter. He said they will choose the best land in Alaska. We provide right in this legislation that they may not choose any of the land which is withdrawn by the Federal Government, which includes the most valuable oil land in Alaska. Further, we expect an amendment will be offered next week to reduce the land grants by 80 million

acres. Personally, I think that is unfortunate, but I believe the committee will accept that amendment. So instead of getting nearly 50 percent of their land, which they should have, they will get about 27 percent of their land. They will not be able to choose from these rich oil lands withdrawn by the Federal Government.

I would suggest to the gentleman and to the other ladies and gentlemen of the House that when you hear talk here about giveaways you think not of your own State but of a vast Territory which has many mountains and other useless places. Think of the fact that to survey a given land as you gave it to other States it would take 12,000 years, and if you attempted to hasten it it would cost a minimum of $120 million. I am sure the gentleman from New York is fully aware of these facts.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished delegate from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

I merely want to add a postscript to what my chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] has said, and that is that the Federal Government has already reserved for its own uses in Alaska some of the very best land there, the tremendous acreage of 92 million acres. The State of Alaska is going to get second choice no matter how many acres are given to it in any statehood bill. The Federal Government has taken the best already.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As a matter of fact, under the Federal laws we allow the citizens of the United States to homestead lands. This has been a traditional procedure. When the lands are opened up in Alaska the same rights of citizenship will accrue there to the people who want to go to Alaska to live there that have accrued in other States of the Union.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. We must keep in mind that there were only Thirteen Original States in the Union. Every one of the other 35 States had to be admitted into the Union. As we look back through our past history, we find that the same arguments were made against the admission of many of the 35 additional States as we hear being made here today against the admission of Alaska. The same arguments were made against the admission of Utah, Wyoming and Montana and many of the other States as are being made against Alaska today. It is hard for me to understand how anyone coming from a State other than one of the Original Thirteen States can forget and overlook the history of their own State when it was admitted to the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues will bear with me, I would like to develop a few thoughts that I believe are of value for the RECORD.

PUBLIC OPINION AND ALASKA STATEHOOD

We are frequently asked, How responsive should an elective body be to public opinion?

Should a Representative always follow the wishes of his constituents?

These questions arise occasionally in the minds of our membership. We all know that because we have discussed the problem with some of our colleagues.

Every Member properly reserves the right to follow the dictates of his conscience. At times, he may be in disagreement with the sentiment of his constituency, and so vote.

Yet I think few of my colleagues will dissent from the view that unless a Representative has a deep conviction, that his vote must be cast on one side of an issue regardless of his constituents' wishes, or unless he believes that his constituency is badly misled and mistaken, he is bound to be powerfully influenced by public sentiment in his District. Especially will this be so if this sentiment at home is clearly not the result of some unusual happening, some spectacular event, some national or local crisis which will cause a sudden swing of opinion into attitudes that may be altered when passion or alarm subside. If public opinion on a given issue is persistently held, grows in strength, and is not due to obvious misconceptions, then certainly few of us would maintain that such opinion was not a potent or even a determining factor in our legislative decisions.

Which brings me to point out that on few public issues has there been so widespread, so general, a sentiment, as that which favors the admission of Alaska to statehood.

That striking fact is proved by a dozen and a half legislative polls taken in as many Congressional Districts over the last 4 years. They show:

First, that public sentiment in the United States strongly favors statehood for Alaska.

Second, that the sentiment is universal, and it is found in every section—east, west, north, south, and in between.

The next poll, taken early in 1957, was in south central Texas, in the 21st District, represented by O. CLARK FISHER, of San Angelo.

Third, that that sentiment has grown steadily, reaching new highs.

Fourth, that statehood is not only favored, but favored by very substantial majorities. Few of us are so fortunate as to be elected in our Districts by the majorities which they give statehood for Alaska.

I have recorded in my remarks today the results of 18 polls which have been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I may, inadvertently, have omitted some. If so, the omission is unintentional. I have sought to make the record complete, and if there are published polls on Alaskan statehood that I have overlooked, I shall be happy to have them called to my attention. Eleven of these 18 polls were taken by Republicans, 7 by Democrats.

The first poll I have recorded was taken in 1954 in the 11th Massachusetts District, ably represented by THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR. The poll showed 69 percent favoring statehood, 17 percent opposed, a ratio of slightly better than 4 to 1. In giving these proportions, I am excluding those who say they have no opinion.

The next poll, in chronological order, was taken in the First Iowa District, represented at that time by our former colleague, THOMAS E. MARTIN, now the junior Senator from the Hawkeye State. The vote there was 81 percent for statehood, 18 percent opposed—a majority of 4½ to 1.

In western Nebraska, in the State's Fourth District, our colleague, A. L. MILLER, took a poll in the spring of 1955. Result: 78 percent, yes; 22 percent, no, or—just 3½ to 1 for statehood.

In June 1955, our friend, THOMAS L. ASHLEY took a poll in his Ninth Ohio District—an urban and industrial area in the northwestern part of the Buckeye State. There, 73 percent favored statehood, 22 percent opposed—a ratio of well over 3 to 1.

The following year, 1956, produced another Ohio poll in the opposite part—the southeastern end of the State, in the rural and agricultural area represented by JOHN E. HENDERSON. His constituents voted 86.4 percent for statehood. He did not report the remaining 13.6 percent, as to whether they were opposed or had no opinion.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The gentleman is talking in percentages. Does he have the numbers?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not have them here. They are in the RECORD. I think the percentages are indicative, because they are all over the Nation. The Gallup poll percentages are taken the same way.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. As I observed in my remarks, if the Gallup poll was indicative, Tom Dewey would be President.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. When there are differences of 4 or 5 percent, the gentleman's remark is well taken, but when you are talking in percentages of 4 to 1, I think no man who understands polls would say that that type of poll is not indicative of general sentiment in his District.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I was really seeking information.

Mr. CANFIELD. Was the gentleman not referring to the Literary Digest Poll? After that poll the Literary Digest became extinct.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thought that was another transaction. I was thinking about 1948, to be honest.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to put in a few more of these polls.

There, the vote was yes, 67 percent; no, 17 percent—a shade under 4 to 1. Another Texas poll in the 16th District, the most westerly Texas district, represented by J. T. RUTHERFORD, showed 79 percent, yes; 21 percent, no—not far from 4 to 1. A third Texas poll in JIM WRIGHT'S District—the 12th—which is chiefly the fine city of Fort Worth, showed 80 percent for statehood, 10 percent against—or a vote of 8 to 1. Thus, 3 Texas districts—2 of them favoring

Alaskan statehood by just under 4 to 1, one of them by 8 to 1—would indicate that Texans do not balk at the idea of admitting a State larger than the Lone Star State. In fact, they welcome it. Good old, little Texas.

In the Empire State—in a district both urban and suburban, in northwestern New York—WILLIAM E. MILLER found that in his 40th District, 74 percent favored statehood, 13 percent did not—a ratio of 5½ to 1.

In the Show Me State, MORGAN MOULDER showed that in the heart of the Nation—his 11th Missouri District, in the center of the State—79.6 percent favored statehood, 10.1 percent did not—or just under 8 to 1.

In West Virginia's 4th District, WILL E. NEAL learned that 71 percent of his constituents favored statehood and 21 percent did not—a majority of over 3 to 1.

In Ohio, our third poll in the Buckeye State, WILLIAM E. MINSHALL—representing the 23d District—found 82 percent favoring statehood, 10 percent opposed—over 8 to 1. Is it not striking how closely those 3 Ohio polls parallel the 3 Texas polls, representing in both States, both urban and rural constituencies?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Cape Cod who is always so fair and forthright.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman knows how I like to go to Cape Cod in the summer each year and talk to people who love him so much.

Mr. NICHOLSON. And I love them, too.

On this question of the Gallup poll, when they ask you a question, what is the question? Is it, "Do you favor Alaska becoming a State?" or do they say, "Are you in favor of admitting Alaska with all the things we will have to do to take care of them?" Do they ask those questions, or is it just "Do you favor taking Alaska and Hawaii and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in as States?"

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If I may answer, my answer to that would be that I am not questioning the type of question which my colleagues answered, although I may comment on 1 or 2 of the questions in a few minutes and show you a surprising result. I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] is on the floor when I get to that particular poll, because I know he will be interested in it.

Now, we cross south, below the Mason-Dixon line, into the Old Dominion State. There, in BURR HARRISON'S 7th District, the people who elected him voted 69 percent for statehood, 20 percent against—approximately 3½ to 1.

Next, we sound out the voters in the Prairie State. But the voters in EMMET BYRNE'S 3d Illinois District are scarcely prairie dwellers. They live in the heart of the great Midwest metropolis, Chicago. There, 80 percent favored statehood for Alaska, 12 percent opposed—a ratio of over 6½ to 1.

We now come to the present year, 1958. In the Wolverine State, ROBERT P. GRIFFIN found that 84 percent of those polled in his 9th Michigan District favored statehood, 7.1 percent opposed, a shade under 12 to 1.

Back in New York, in the 39th District, HAROLD C. OSTERTAG found that 85 percent favored statehood, 9 percent opposed—or over 9 to 1.

Two more polls, taken this year, belong in a special category, because the question regarding statehood was not a simple recording of voters' opinion, but appeared to be in the category of what are known as leading questions:

In the 18th California District, 1 of the 12 Congressional Districts in Los Angeles County, CRAIG HOSMER'S poll asked:

> Do you believe that because of present world conditions we should wait before granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii.

I leave for your own judgment as to whether or not that would be, in the parlance of legal interrogation, known as a leading question.

Well, 61 percent of CRAIG HOSMER'S constituents said "No"—we should not wait, but go right ahead with statehood, and 27 percent said "Yes," we should wait—over 2 to 1 for proceeding immediately to grant statehood, despite their Representative's hint that waiting might be preferable.

Finally, one of the most interesting exhibits of voter sentiment is found in New York's 42d District. It is represented by our friend JOHN R. PILLION. He has devoted his all-out efforts to fighting statehood for Alaska and Hawaii—by press release, public address, radio, television, in committee, and on the floor of the House—for three whole Congresses. If any Member of Congress deserves the title of "Mr. Antistatehood," it is JOHN R. PILLION. If constituents of any Congressman are indoctrinated with antistatehood arguments, they would certainly be his. Recently, he sent out a questionnaire. To say that it was slanted, would do his talents an injustice. To say that it was loaded, would come closer to accuracy. He did not poll his constituents on Alaska and Hawaii separately. He combined the two Territories, with the question:

> Do you favor statehood for the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska now?

And followed this with the further questions:

> Or would you prefer to delay statehood until—
>
> (a) Communist influence in Hawaiian politics is eradicated; and
>
> (b) Legislation is enacted which would apportion membership in the United States Senate on some equitable population basis for States hereafter admitted; or
>
> (c) Require Alaska and Hawaii to consent to less than two United States Senators—

In addition, Representative PILLION accompanied the questionnaire with a memorandum of issues relating to the questions.

Nevertheless, JOHN PILLION'S constituents answered the question, "Do you favor statehood for Hawaii and Alaska now?" with 4,339 votes "yes" and 3,867 "no."

Representative PILLION'S District, the 42d, is contiguous to MILLER'S 40th and OSTERTAG'S 39th, which, as they recorded, gave ratios of 5½ to 1 and 9 to 1, respectively, for Alaskan statehood.

An interesting thing occurs here, because Representative PILLION'S District, the 42d, is contiguous to Representative MILLER'S 40th and Mr. OSTERTAG'S 39th, which, as they recorded a simple question, gave answers 5½ to 1 in favor of statehood and 9 to 1; and I would challenge my friend to send out a straight question to his constituents. I guarantee the difference between yes and no would be more sharply defined.

The fact is that no poll taken in the last 3 years anywhere in the United States shows any constituency not favoring statehood, and none—except HOSMER'S and PILLION'S—by less than 3 to 1, and most of them higher.

These favorable pro-Alaskan statehood polls were taken throughout the Union, in States touching the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Canadian and Mexican borders, indeed, "from the mountains to the prairies, from the oceans white with foam," in rural and urban areas, in Democratic and Republican districts. Everywhere, the people wanted Alaska to be a State.

And finally is the overall, and overwhelming evidence of the Gallup polls, which show how the nationwide sentiment for Alaskan statehood has grown. From 5 to 1 in 1946, to 7 to 1 in 1956, to 9 to 1 in 1957, and this year, as recently as last March, to 12 to 1. Twelve to one. Now. On what other public issues do we get as close to unanimity?

The American people have spoken. They have spoken over a period of years. This is no fleeting emotion on their part. This is a call, a clarion call, welling up from the hearts of Americans, from the deep consciousness of their destiny, an expression of yearning to add one more great chapter to the American story, one more verse to the American epic. Their chorus of approval for Alaskan statehood has swelled to a mighty symphony.

Even if I did not believe wholeheartedly in statehood for Alaska, I would vote for statehood as an act of simple justice after 91 years of strangling territorialism; as an overdue fulfillment of treaty pledges and platform commitments; as of great value to our whole people in opening up a new frontier of opportunity in a time of recession; as an extension of democracy to our Nation's farthest North and farthest West; as an evidence that our Nation is still young, still on the march, still imbued with the pioneer spirit; as a validation of that most basic of American principles—the principle of government by consent of the governed; as an act that will contrast Russia's enslavement of her satellites with America's conferment of equality on a dependency, especially one that once belonged to Russia, and which lies within naked-eye view of the Soviet police state; as an evidence to all mankind that America practices what it preaches, even if I did not believe—as I do—in any of these valid reasons for conferring statehood on Alaska, I would unhesitatingly rise to the compelling call of American public opinion, and vote to make Alaska the 49th State.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman perhaps is acquainted with Dr. Miller's poll taken in Alaska?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Taken in Alaska?

Mr. PILLION. Yes. It is in the RECORD of July 1, 1957. He asked this question, which is not slanted in any way: "Do you favor immediate statehood for Alaska?" And, the answer from Alaska was, "Yes, 522; no, 1,394." In other words, a ratio of more than 2 to 1 against statehood right in Alaska.

Could the gentleman tell me whether one-half or one-quarter percent of the people who were polled in the various polls that were cited by the gentleman from California ever read any one of these statehood bills or ever read the debates or the articles pro and con and really studied these things? The gentleman must know that these are not mature judgments, such as we are called upon to render here; that the polls are mere impulsive first-hand opinions, and that is all they are. So, certainly the gentleman would not recommend that we act in this House according to polls. The people are entitled to more than merely a reflection of first-hand opinions, and we in this House, rather than taking those opinions, should study the matter and give it very serious and sober consideration before we pass judgment on a matter as important as statehood.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would just briefly say that I do not have the time to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Just on one of these many polls that have been taken. I might point out there is a big difference between a poll in Alaska and the polls mentioned by the gentleman from California. These polls were addressed to specific individuals in their districts asking for guidance on important public problems, one of which was statehood. The one in Alaska was a newspaper poll, and I know how I would feel on a newspaper poll if I were a Federal employee who might lose his job or a military officer or an individual who thought he would lose the 25 percent pay differential. There were several hundred affirmative votes on statehood for Alaska that I did not put in the committee record because I did not think that was the way to find out what the public was thinking about.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, who looks like a friend of Alaska.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the most compelling reason for statehood for Alaska is the strength that this will give our national defense. However, I wish to address my remarks to remarks of some of my colleagues who raise the point that they think Alaska has not enough population to justify statehood.

If the policy of not admitting States with fewer people than those already in the Union had prevailed from the beginning, we should still be a nation of 13 States.

The United States would still be a thin fringe of States along the Atlantic seaboard.

But our predecessors in Congress, fortunately, did not pursue that policy, and the United States has become a great nation, continental in size, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I doubt whether anyone present regrets that this is so, or would seek to undo it, if he could. Our Nation grew in strength, power, and greatness as we admitted new States to the Union.

Actually, Alaska has more population today, with some 210,000, than had two-thirds of the States admitted after the Original Thirteen at the time of their admission. The estimated population of Florida, my home State, at the time of admission was 72,000.

Alaska will have far more population, and rapidly, when it achieves statehood.

Those of us who have observed the restrictive policies pursued toward Alaska, for some of which our own Congress has been responsible, some of which have arisen from bureaucratic practices, will realize as I do how difficult it is for Alaska to grow in population under its present Territorial status.

The way to get more population to Alaska—and quickly—is by conferring upon its people the equality and sovereignty of statehood.

It has been argued by some that while this was a practice that we approved of in the past, we must not extend it into the future. They argue that if we pursue this policy we shall soon have a more disproportionate representation in the Senate than we have now. Conceivably—if there were a prospect of admitting another dozen or two dozen States—there might be a basis for this fear. But a realistic appraisal of the situation will make clear that by no stretch of imagination is there any probability of even any serious request for statehood for any in excess of two additional States.

According to traditional practice, in order to become a State, an area must first become an incorporated Territory. We have only two incorporated Territories. We need never have any more. I don't know whether we ever will have. In the case of Alaska, I can confidently predict—from my knowledge of its resources and its vast potentials—that it will not remain long a "small" State, meaning "small" in terms of population.

Alaska with statehood, will become the American equivalent of Scandinavia. Theodore Roosevelt pointed that out over half a century ago. Across the world, in corresponding latitudes, with the same climates, and with natural resources not as great as those of Alaska, the 3 Scandinavian countries and Finland, in an area about three-quarters of Alaska's, have a population of 18 million people, supported by a thriving economy.

What is the reason, then, that these countries, lying between the latitudes of the 54th and 72d parallels—as does Alaska—have this vast population, while Alaska has not? There are several reasons.

In the first place, they have government by consent of the governed. Despite the fact that three of them have kings, they are democracies. Their ideas of freedom are the same as ours. They possess the basic political ingredient which made our Nation great. Alaskans do not have government by consent of the governed. Statehood will give it to them.

Second, the Scandinavians have been at it for 2,000 years. Alaska has been under the flag for 91 years, but during that time—regrettable as it may be to confess it—Federal policies have been so restrictive that Alaska could not develop.

Third, the Scandinavian countries and Finland, have been, and are close to the greatest centers of population—Berlin, Hamburg, Amsterdam, Antwerp, Brussels, London, Paris, St. Petersburg—now Leningrad—which have furnished, and continue to furnish them markets for their exports. Alaska, on the other hand, has been remote. Its nearest areas on the Continent have been sparsely settled. The air age, the jet age, is transforming all that.

Give Alaska statehood and I prophecy within 5 years it will have half a million people, a million at the end of the first decade, and will continue to grow. The way to meet the small population argument is to vote for statehood.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, former Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, of New Jersey, worked in the Territory of Alaska as a lad. He fell in love with the Territory and is a great champion of its cause for statehood today. I have a letter from the Governor of very recent date in which he says in part:

> For many years I have earnestly sought statehood for Alaska. I recognize there are some interests on the west coast that, for personal reasons, have opposed statehood. On the other hand, if we are to maintain a real leadership, we must practice what we preach—and this, in my judgment, includes fair play for our Territories.
>
> Over the years the United States has achieved an unparalleled record of giving freedom to people who, through the chances of war or fate, found themselves within our protective custody. If we had wished to be a colonial power, Cuba and the Philippines would have offered us tremendous opportunities.
>
> With such a record, it is hard for me to understand why we have been so slow to fulfill the hopes of the Alaskans and Hawaiians. The inhabitants of these Territories have earned their right to full citizenship in our Republic. Indeed, they have served a longer apprenticeship than was served by the inhabitants of many of the Western States prior to their admission to the Union.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, by adding another star to our flag, we

strengthen our heritage of liberty and freedom.

I am stirred by a reading of the various sections of Alaska's Constitution which guarantee the right of its citizens. Appropriately, they are included in the very first article.

They reaffirm those principles of human dignity that are being challenged as never before in the history of freedom by the tyranny of Communist totalitarianism.

I repeat, admitting into our Union a State dedicated to those principles strengthens our own heritage of liberty. Moreover, in this grave hour of history we need to command all such possible resources of spirit, as well as material, for our arsenal of defense if we are to experience the victory which should be ours.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" cannot be repeated often enough if we are to be constantly reminded of the wisdom of that slogan of a free society.

We need to guard against all corrosions to our liberty. A vigilance must always be exercised in combatting it. Maintaining liberty requires nothing less.

There is no question in my mind after a reading of Alaska's Constitution that this wisdom will be hers in the years to come.

This record on the admission of Alaska will be, I hope, a basic document of Alaska's history as well as our own. I think it more than appropriate, therefore, to discuss candidly some of our own failings so that Alaska might take heed in preserving from corrosiveness her own noble traditions in the decades to come.

This record on the admission of Alaska should include comment on some of our practices which do not reflect exactly the traditions expressed so eloquently in article 1 of Alaska's Constitution—to be found on page 49 of House Report No. 624 of this Congress.

The Bible suggests:

> Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall.

I feel impelled to comment on the significance of section 7, article 1, of Alaska's Constitution which reads, as does our Federal fifth amendment:

> No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.

Then, the section goes on to guarantee that—

> The right of all persons to fair and just treatment in the course of legislative and executive investigations shall not be infringed.

This is a magnificent formulation of a protection which I hope we can establish fully in our law to protect citizens in their rights against encroachments by legislative investigation.

I take heart in Alaska's recognizing the necessity for formulating a guaranty against this threat to freedom.

It should be stated that as blunt and clumsy an instrument as it is, the investigative power is a necessary part of our lawmaking process. We need not dwell long on the proposition that Congress could not perform effectively its basic appropriation and lawmaking functions without the power to investigate.

Indeed, I think it will become an even more important aspect of lawmaking in the years to come. We will not be able to legislate in a growingly complex society without exercising first the power to investigate exhaustively.

I think that we need not dwell likewise on the further proposition that effective use of the investigative power necessitates compelling citizens to testify. This, in turn, involves imposing criminal penalty if such a subpenaed witness refuses to testify.

And so section 192 of title 2 of the United States Code reads that:

> Every person who having been summoned as a witness by the authority of either House of Congress to give testimony or to produce papers upon any matter under inquiry before either House * * * willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question to the question under inquiry.

The courts have held in language which I believe is deeply rooted in our American tradition of individual liberty, that such power has definite limits.

In Watkins against United States the Supreme Court held in its central holding that a "person is entitled to have knowledge of the subject to which the interrogation is deemed pertinent with the same degree of explicitness and clarity that the due-process clause requires in the expression of any element of a criminal offense."

Certainly no one can dispute the proposition that if a person is going to be indicted for criminal contempt because of his refusal to answer a question put by a Congressional committee, he should be accorded the same basis for predicting the consequences of his conduct as he does with respect to every other criminal conduct.

Let me say that the ability to predict the criminal consequence of one's act is perhaps the essential difference between life in a free society and life in a Communist society.

The Court sustained this principle in Watkins against United States. And I cannot see how any thoughtful American could disagree with this result.

I think we in the House recognize that the Watkins case does not provide a remedy specific enough to curb the chief abuses involved in the Congressional investigative process by its central holding.

The question which we have to face is whether it is ever possible to determine the pertinence of a question with the clarity constitutionally required of a criminal statute.

I think Mr. Justice Clark did raise this problem in his dissent:

> Such a requirement has never been thought applicable to investigations, and is wholly out of place * * * . The Congress does not have the facts at the time of the investigation for it is the facts that are being sought. In a criminal trial the investigation has been completed and all of the facts are at hand. * * * In the conduct of such a proceeding it is impossible to be as explicit and exact as in a criminal prosecution.

The majority, however, faced the problem in a more affirmative manner.

Mr. Chief Justice Warren's discussion of the factors involved in the Watkins case itself in determining pertinence suggests the difficulty in according the witness, before he refuses to answer a question the same degree of predictability available to him in a law defining a criminal offense. He discussed such factors as the prohibition against governmental intrusion afforded by the first amendment, the lack of power in Congress to expose for exposure's sake, and the scope of the committee's authorization from Congress.

These are limits to governmental power which are often blurred, and have to be studied in the light of a whole and complicated record before they can be made specific. Thus, the question remains whether a witness should have to risk criminal penalty in making this kind of difficult judgment, on the spur of the moment.

I think in all candor we should admit that more extensive oral remarks made by the chairman of a Congressional investigating committee outlining the exact purview of a particular hearing—as suggested by the Court—will help less than most people imagine in establishing for the witness the constitutionally guaranteed sense of predictability.

It is not difficult for a committee to establish an apparently logical pertinence of a question to a legislative purpose, so as to put the witness in considerable quandary before deciding to challenge the committee in its right to ask the question.

The present criminal statute penalizing a witness for refusing to answer any question pertinent to an inquiry was passed in 1857. Before this came into existence, a recalcitrant witness was tried before the full House and might be ordered to answer a specific question.

In this procedure, as a matter of fact, the witness had an ample opportunity to be informed of the pertinence of that question, and did not risk criminal punishment. This has not been true since 1857. The recalcitrant witness has had to face a criminal prosecution, during which pertinence as well as propriety of the question is determined, and avoidance of criminal punishment rests on the accuracy of his original judgment.

The Watkins decision does suggest that in time the courts will hammer out a rule of reason in defining constitutional limits to Congressional investigative power, but a witness should be able to determine, before criminal prosecution, what would be the consequences of his decision to challenge a committee's right to ask a question without himself having to apply a rule of reason to a complicated situation.

In this connection, I would like to take note of H. R. 259, introduced by my distinguished colleague on the opposite aisle, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], which has been approved by the House Judiciary Committee.

The bill would authorize Congressional committees to apply to a Federal District Court to pass upon the propriety of a question which a witness has refused to answer; if the court found the question proper, it would order the witness to answer.

Under the procedure of the bill, a witness may have the opportunity to raise all defenses—first amendment, lack of authorization, impertinence, and so forth—and obtain a judicial determination of the committee's right to ask the question before facing a criminal prosecution. This type of legislation should be more fully studied. It suggests what might prove to be one of the most significant safeguards yet proposed against investigative abuse.

Future legislatures of the State of Alaska may well examine closely the work and procedures of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

I would like to have it clearly understood that my thinking is based upon my own independent soul searching of this problem which was largely prompted by the Supreme Court's decision in Watkins against United States when it was handed down almost a year ago on June 17, 1957.

I think the time is due for some hard-headed thinking on some of the questions regarding the status of the House Un-American Activities Committee which has been posed by the courts.

And I would like to reiterate my feeling that including these remarks in the record on Alaska's admission is the appropriate time. It is to be hoped, for instance, that the Alaskan Legislature in implementing article I of its constitution, will never fall into the error of giving a mandate to an investigating committee, which reads as follows: To investigate "the extent, character, and objects of un-American activities in the United States" and "the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution"—mandate to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

In view of the central holding on the Watkins case, I ask my colleagues how in the world can a witness resolve for himself whether a question put by the committee is authorized in view of the vagueness of the authorization which spills over into constitutional doubt.

I think Chief Justice Warren's comment in this connection is appropriate:

> It would be difficult to imagine a less explicit authorizing resolution. Who can define the meaning of "Un-American"? What is that single, solitary "principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

And then the Chief Justice goes on:

> It is, of course, not the function of this Court to prescribe rigid rules for the Congress to follow in drafting resolutions establishing investigating committees. That is a matter peculiarly within the realm of the legislature, and its decisions will be accepted by the courts up to the point where their own duty to enforce the constitutionally protected rights of the individual is affected. An excessively broad charter, like that of the House Un-American Activities Committee, places the courts in an untenable position if they are to strike a balance between the public need for a particular interrogation and the right of citizens to carry on their affairs free from unnecessary governmental interference. It is impossible in such a situation to ascertain whether any legislative purpose justifies the disclosures sought, and, if so, the importance of that information to the Congress in furtherance of its legislative function. The reason no court can make this critical judgment is that the House of Representatives itself has never made it. Only the legislative assembly initiating an investigation can assay the relative necessity of specific disclosures.

It seems to me that the judiciary has a right, and duty as a matter of fact, to tell the legislative branch, "If you want us to process a criminal prosecution for contempt of Congress, we need a basis for determining pertinency, as an element of criminal conduct. We do not have it in the mandate of the House Un-American Activities Committee. It is too vaguely written."

On July 1, 1957, my esteemed friend and colleague from California [Mr. DOYLE] introduced House Resolution 307, providing for change in the mandate and name of the House Un-American Activities Committee, attempting to cure the vagueness discussed in the Watkins decision. As far as I can discover no action or consideration has been given by the Rules Committee to which the resolution was referred.

However, I regret that in reading the provision of the resolution I do not find the solution. It authorizes investigations into "the extent, character, and objects of subversive activities and propaganda in the United States" and to investigate "the origin, extent, character, and control and objects of any subversive movement in the United States and to destroy the representative form of government provided for in the United States Constitution, by its use of deceitful infiltration of other groups; conspiracy, treachery, sabotage, espionage, terrorism, subversion, and any subversive activity and propaganda."

It seems to me with all due respect to my dear friend from California the term "propaganda" covers speech, writing, and association, all of which involve conduct protected by the first amendment. Since this is an area about which we cannot legislate, we are precluded from investigating.

While some of the objectives of a subversive movement, in the last part of the language I quoted, are specified, several of the standards of judgment are so subjective that they are bound to restrict free speech and association. Such imprecise wording may not meet the limits suggested by the Supreme Court in its Watkins decision.

I do not believe that we should abolish the function of investigating matters legitimately related to the area of internal security about which we could legislate. I believe to do so would be in dereliction of our duty.

However, in so doing, we have to meet the problem suggested in the United States Court of Appeals dissent of Chief Justice Edgerton in Barenblatt against United States, decided on January 16, 1958, which I believe to be expressive of the Supreme Court ruling in the Watkins case.

I understand Watkins to hold that the Committee on Un-American Activities had no authority to compel testimony because it had no definite assignment from Congress. The Supreme Court said: "When first amendment rights are threatened, the delegation of power to the committee must be clearly revealed in its charter."

In short, I do not think we can possibly continue in the 86th Congress with the mandate of the present House Un-American Activities Committee. I think we have no other choice but to repeal the mandate given to the committee since 1938, and rewrite it with clarity and preciseness.

Accordingly, I respectfully submit to my colleagues that this matter must be given the utmost attention and thought from this point on, so that we can deal intelligently with the problem at the very start of the 86th Congress.

I think that my colleagues, regardless of political disposition, and including the members of the House Un-American Activities Committee, will agree that the problem of fighting communism from the point of view of internal security is a different problem today than it was 20 years ago or even 10 years ago. The ease with which the committee, by following wrong paths, can lose the support of American citizens who are known to be conservative in their views is well illustrated by a letter by Frank Waldrop addressed to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald and published on Saturday, February 15, 1958. I quote it because this is the opinion of no radical leftwinger, but rather that of a former editor of the Washington Times Herald, well known for its consistently conservative viewpoint:

UN-AMERICAN MISCHIEF IN INDONESIA

I have just finished trying to read a document entitled "International Communism" (Communist Designs on Indonesia and the Pacific Frontier), published December 16, 1957, by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a staff consultation with Gen Charles A. Willoughby, the former Chief of Army Intelligence in the Far Eastern Command under General MacArthur.

General Willoughby proves without any doubt that Communists have designs on Indonesia and that Communists exist in Indonesia and have influence there. This astonishing discovery equals in news value and importance the truth that Communists have designs on the United States, that Communists exist here and have influence here.

Sometimes, indeed, when I reflect on my now nearly 30 years of intensive effort to understand communism and its unique methods of operation, I am almost persuaded that it has built as one of the most effective engines the House Committee on Un-American Activities, with which I have spent so many futile hours of effort and vain hope that it would learn its business.

What excuse, in God's name, has any committee of Congress for spending the taxpayers' money on such indefensible drivel as this compound of Willoughby's? By what test can the committee justify issuing this staff consultation as if it were a thing of value and discovery?

As it happens, I know something about Indonesia myself, especially as it is today by comparison with what it wanted to be when it became an independent nation. My first knowledge of what was brewing out there came in the winter of 1942–43, when Mr. Van Mook, the Governor General of the late Netherlands East Indies, undertook to educate us here in Washington about the Netherlands' plan for reformed colonial government in the Indies after the war.

The situation at the time was that the Japanese had just thrown the Dutch out of the Orient in violent style, and apparently

without much difficulty. Then any Dutch in the Indies were doing their best to look small and avoid anything to remind either J panese or the people of the region of their presence.

The American performance in the Philippines was not much, perhaps, as a military demonstration against the Japanese; but as a character test for the men and women on Bataan it hadn't done anything to destroy us with the people of the region, and our prewar commitment to work for Philippine independence was both believable and believed, then and thereafter.

But here was Van Mook running around Washington, while the Japanese were chasing Dutchmen through the woods of the Guineas, with a grandiose plan for "elevating the natives" from their former low estate to some kind of "equality within the Netherlands Empire," once the war was over, of course, and all had returned to normal.

I was one invited to the Netherlands Embassy (not since, I may add), to hear the plan presented and to offer comments. All I asked, and in those days I had little notion of the situation in the Orient as it was and was to become—all I asked was what we were supposed to do if the little brown brothers didn't like being little brown brothers, but instead just wanted to be people on their own.

Before the evening was over, I was well established as a low fellow who had no understanding of the "real" problem out there.

The actuality of politics in all of Asia in 1942 was plain as day. Need I spell it out? I can do no better than General Willoughby's chief, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in his superb address to Congress after he came home in supposed disgrace as a casualty, after many years of high honor and great public service, to the ineptitudes of President Truman.

MacArthur's speech to Congress is all anybody needs to aline himself with the facts of life and politics in all the Pacific regions. The central point is that the people of Asia have aims and hopes and aspirations to live the modern life. They have become national in their attitudes. They have shown themselves determined to make their own mistakes, rather than go on taking the blows that come from the mistakes of others.

Certainly it is true that Indonesia, today, is having ghastly troubles making its way in the world. Certainly it is true that the Communists will destroy Indonesia if they can. But the question is whether the Indonesians will be able to survive the problems of emergence from centuries of blight at the hands of colonial imperialism. Do we want the Indonesians to survive or do we want them to fail?

If we want them to fail we can continue puffing up such peculiar thoughts as those which seem to obsess Willoughby, namely, that calling Indonesian leaders hard names will make them go away. We can also occupy ourselves with refusing to give ear to Indonesian friends who try to tell us their difficulties and their hopes. We can refuse them the respect and friendly consideration that one grown man offers and expects in his dealings with others who grow up, too, and have done so.

Such a policy of negation and fretful childishness has already cost us much in the Middle East. Now are we to cost ourselves remnants of friendship in the Pacific regions, such as we have?

Just which side is this Willoughby working for, anyhow? And I may ask the same of this nonsensical committee which has, indeed, at last established itself as clearly the true Committee on Un-American Activities. The joke is feeble and damned tired, I will admit, and I wish it didn't fit. But it does.

To this I would like to add the words of our respected colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], the ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Committee, who certainly cannot be attacked as a radical thinker. He said, in an article in 29 Notre Dame Lawyer 212:

> The rights of Congress are no broader than the legitimate objects from which they have been implied. And I believe those objects are only the two referred to a moment ago: (1) to gather facts about proposed legislation, and (2) to inquire into the workings of existing Federal laws. There lies the first and perhaps the only important substantive restraint which Congress must impose upon itself. No Congressional investigation is justified unless it can be directly related to the lawmaking process in one of these two ways. In other fields, the investigations are proper and often necessary, but not by Congress. It follows that I disagree strongly with those who argue that Congress is also responsible for informing and educating the public by looking into anything which may happen to catch the popular fancy at the moment.

Mr. KEATING may well have put his capable hand on just the kind of thing which would have eliminated the recent spectacular announcement that a subpena had been signed for the appearance of Mr. Cyrus Eaton. I understand that Mr. Eaton has not been served with the subpena, and has not yet even been invited to appear before the committee. I have an idea that he would be delighted to do so, but certainly it must be in a context which does not question the constitutional right of Mr. Eaton to express himself freely, without fear of coercion to himself because of his statements.

I must acknowledge that I, too, think that Mr. Eaton's statements were unfortunate and that he may be guilty of recklessness in equating our FBI and other investigative agencies with Hitler's Gestapo police. But I will defend his right to think so and to say so in a free America, and I would not allow any comparison with Communist censorship.

I congratulate the wisdom of Alaska for her well-composed constitution. I hope that she will benefit from the experiences of our Federal system, good as well as bad. It would be wonderful indeed if the rebirth of the pioneering spirit from this, a new frontier, might bring to all our States a resurgence of that spirit which was written into our Constitution in the Bill of Rights.

I hope this bill will pass. I hope that it will signify to the world the true greatness of American constitutional government and I hope that it will inspire every American citizen to insist in his State that the 21 sections of article I, the declaration of rights in the constitution of the State of Alaska should be equally practiced throughout our land.

The preamble of the constitution might well be a prayer in which all of us may join:

> We the people of Alaska, grateful to God and to those who founded our Nation and pioneered this great land, in order to secure and transmit to succeeding generations our heritage of political, civil, and religious liberty within the Union of States, do ordain and establish this constitution for the State of Alaska.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill to admit the Territory of Alaska as a State of the Union, now under consideration by the House, presents many questions of a fundamental character that require serious and careful consideration.

The matter has been before the Congress in one way or another many times during my service in the House since 1926. Consequently, I have had occasion to study the arguments for and against. I have done so again at this time. After careful consideration, I am of the opinion that it would not be to the best interest of the people of Alaska to grant statehood at this time, but, aside from that, I am further convinced that it is not in the best interest of our country at large and its citizens.

First, with respect to the citizens of Alaska. It has not been made plain to me that the small population now in Alaska could finance the cost of maintaining a State government without a heavy tax burden, a burden that would be, in the opinion of some of its substantial businessmen, too great to be carried. In other words, the economic conditions are not sufficient nor favorable enough at this time to sustain an adequate State government. But, as to this, there is some disagreement between the proponents and opponents of statehood. However, the fact that there is such a pronounced disagreement among prominent citizens of Alaska in this important matter of State government is sufficient in itself, in my opinion, to cause us to be cautious and make certain that we do not place an unbearable burden upon the people of Alaska and thereby destroy the progress and advantages that it is hoped would follow the granting of statehood.

But this feature of doubt as to the ability to carry the cost would not necessarily lead me to vote against statehood for I am aware that a pioneering people can now, as they have so often done in the past, overcome obstacles that have seemed unsurmountable. My basic objection arises from my feeling that it is not in the best interest of all our people when considered from the standpoint of our national welfare.

Foremost in the consideration of our national welfare is the effect the granting of statehood might have or, at least, could have on our national security. We should not overlook the fact that Alaska is one of the most strategic areas in our entire system of national defense. Not only is it separated from the Russian territory of Siberia by less than 30 miles across the Bering Straits, but, in addition its location is peculiarly adapted to the polar air routes that are now receiving so much attention from several nations, including Russia. The North Pole routes to and from Europe and Asia, that are now being developed, require that the whole area constituting Alaska be most carefully guarded against any possible unfriendly approach to our west coast by enemy planes utilizing the polar routes. There is no part of our defense system more important to our national defense than the Territory of Alaska. I am, therefore, strongly of the opinion that because of this it is best at this time, as well as in foreseeable future, that we should keep all the Alaskan area under Federal rather than State control.

It must necessarily be the Federal Government and not the State government that will carry the heavy cost of providing the intricate means of defense in the polar area so necessary in this scientific time in which we live. The Federal Government should have a free hand to accomplish this without any impediment by reason of divided jurisdiction.

Furthermore, Alaska is considered by many to be a land of great wealth in natural resources, particularly in a wide variety of minerals important in war, as well as in peace, including oil and lumber. How extensive these resources may be is not too well known at this time. Whatever does exist in the way of natural resources now belongs to the Federal Government. Under the bill before us making Alaska a State, all these natural resources would be relinquished to the State of Alaska. This is not right to the people of the Nation at large.

Nor, is it fair to the people of our Nation, or the other 48 States, that a Territory with such a small population, approximately only 160,000, should have 2 Senators, the same as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, and our own State of New Jersey, and many others with millions of people living in each of them. Furthermore, it would also have a Member in the House of Representatives, the same as our own First Congressional District of New Jersey that now has over 500,000 population. According to the information I have, less than 30,000 votes in all of Alaska were cast in the last election for officials of the Alaskan government. It is preposterous in my opinion that such senatorial and representation in the House be granted to such a limited number of people. It is all out of proportion to what is right and just. And, you can rest assured if statehood is granted Alaska, it will be only a short time until Hawaii will demand a similar right of statehood, and then possibly Puerto Rico.

The fact that some of our Western States were granted statehood when they had a small population may be true, but it must be remembered that our whole national population was also small at that time. An examination of the population figures at that time will show that the Territories which were granted statehood possessed a much higher comparative percentage toward the whole population of our country than does Alaska today. What advantage would come to any one of our 48 States, or to the Nation as a whole, by granting statehood to Alaska? There is nothing I can see that would begin to compensate for the disadvantages that would accrue.

Thus, as I consider the matter as a whole and evaluate the different elements pro and con, and stripped of all emotionalism, and without mentioning other elements that might also be urged against statehood, I cannot feel justified in supporting the bill that is now before us that seeks to grant statehood to Alaska at this time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that any member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who has an amendment which he intends to offer when we read the bill under the 5-minute rule, may have permission to insert a copy of that amendment in today's RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 7999 TO BE OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF NEBRASKA

On page 15, line 2, after the comma following the word "rejection" add the following: "by separate ballot on each."

On page 15, line 3, add the following language: "(1) Shall Alaska immediately be admitted into the Union as a State?"

On page 15, lines 3 and 8, respectively, change the figures "1" to "2" and "2" to "3."

On page 15, line 14, after the word "event" add the words "each of" and change the word "are" to "is."

On page 15, line 19, after the word "event" add the words "any one of" and change the word "are" to "is."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL DEBATE ON THE BILL H. R. 7999

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further general debate on the bill H. R. 7999 be limited to the legislative sessions of tomorrow, May 23, and Monday, May 26, closing not later than 5 o'clock p. m. on the said May 26, and that one-half of said time be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] and one-half by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

RICE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8490) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to rice acreage allotments, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this the so-called rice bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. That is correct. It is a bill we passed in this body last summer. It has just been acted on by the Senate, with an amendment which applies only to the State of Louisiana and has no effect whatever on any other State.

Mr. MARTIN. I realize that, but I wish the gentleman would withdraw his request at this time. One of the Members on our side who is on the Committee on Agriculture and who I believe is in favor of the gentleman's request is not here and cannot be here until tomorrow morning, and he would like to speak on the bill. I would not like to object to the gentleman's request, so I hope he will withdraw it for the time being.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. It is my understanding the bill has been cleared on the gentleman's side.

Mr. MARTIN. This one Member thought he might have something to say about the bill when it came up.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 12088) extending the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area," approved June 16, 1955 (69 Stat. 136), as amended by the act of February 19, 1957 (71 Stat. 4), is further amended by striking out "3 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "4 years."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CEREMONIES IN CONNECTION WITH THE UNKNOWN SOLDIERS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 90.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives are each hereby authorized and directed to purchase a floral wreath to be placed by the catafalques bearing the remains of the unknowns of World War II and Korea which are to lie in state in the rotunda of the Capitol of the United States from May 28 to May 30, 1958, the expenses of which shall be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PLIGHT OF THE MARINES

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Nation never needed it more, the Marine Corps is being steadily whittled down in strength and fighting power. The Marines pride themselves on being lean and hard, but it is difficult to stay in fighting trim on a starvation diet. The administration's treatment of the Corps is a classic example of penny wise, pound foolish, for the Marines have always been able to make a dollar go farther than the larger services.

By law, the Marine Corps is required to maintain three combat divisions and three aircraft wings. To maintain these air-ground teams requires 215,000 Marines; however, in the face of directed economies, the Marines have calculated that a strength of 200,000 would give them a marginal capability of fielding the three divisions and wings, although all units would lack staying power. But even this minimum figure is being denied them. Over the past 3 years, the Corps has been steadily forced down from just over 200,000 to a directed strength of 175,000 by the end of fiscal year 1959. This will mean that the marine combat forces will then be at 75 percent strength—in other words, if they have to go into combat, they will have suffered 25 percent casualties before a shot is fired.

It is universally accepted that limited war is the most likely threat. To meet this threat, we need balanced mobile forces—versatile forces which can move to the scene of trouble on the shortest notice. We have such forces—or at least we have had—in the United States Marine Corps. Why are we putting the economy squeeze on this unique body of fighting men?

In the 182 years of its existence, the Marine Corps has never failed to respond to emergencies. The Marines have always been ready to fight for this country—and they have fought on almost every continent on earth. In recent months, they have again shown the world what a force in readiness really is: in the simmering Mediterranean, the ubiquitous Marines were on the scene during the Suez crisis; they stood by when little Jordan was threatened by aggression. At the peak of the Soviet threat to the whole Middle East, Marines from Okinawa also moved quietly towards the Red Sea, ready to lend a hand if required. Additional Marine units here in the States were ready to go if needed. In fact, elements of all three division-wing teams are on a 24-hour alert at all times. This is readiness—the kind of readiness the world has learned to expect of the Marines—the kind of readiness the Communists respect—the kind of readiness this country now needs more than ever before.

Much has been said recently about the importance of truly unified commands. It is worth noting that the Marines always fight as part of a unified command—first, as part of that unified Navy-Marine team, the balanced fleet; and second, as part of formally established unified commands in the Atlantic, Pacific, and Mediterranean areas.

Austerity is more than a watchword in the Marine Corps—it is a way of life. The latest available figures show that the average cost per marine is several hundred dollars less than in the next least expensive service. The percentage of officers to total strength is less than any other service, as is the percentage of senior officers and noncommissioned officers. Fewer marines, percentagewise, draw extra pay, such as flight pay, parachute-jump pay, and so forth, than in the other services. Because of this habit of economy, the Marines estimate that to maintain the marginal strength of 200,000 in fiscal year 1959 would cost only $42 million more than the drastic reduction to 175,000. Forty-two million dollars is about what the Secretary of Defense spends per year to run just his own office—which do you think would contribute more to national security, 25,000 marines or 2,500 clerks and administrators?

The statutory requirement for three marine divisions and three marine aircraft wings calls for a corps of 215,000 Marines. Any reduction below that figure reduces the combat potential of those divisions and wings. The Marines say they can accept the risks involved in a decrease to 200,000, but the directed reduction to 175,000 can only be considered seriously disabling. The Commandant of the Marine Corps has testified that such a reduction will place the corps in a very precarious position. It could even bring the corps to the point where its readiness to accomplish its mission is destroyed. This must not be allowed to happen. For a change, we must make the modest expenditure which will maintain the combat effectiveness of the most useful forces the Nation has today—the United States Marine Corps.

I trust that in the consideration of the forthcoming legislation involving the reorganization of the defense structure my distinguished colleagues will make sure with me that the Marine Corps is brought up to and maintained at its full and necessary strength of 215,000 dedicated American servicemen. If necessary, I shall offer an amendment to the bill on the floor of the House to accomplish this purpose and also to provide the appropriate funds therefor.

We will make sure by this new legislation that the Department of Defense understands once and for all the intent of the people and of the Congress, and that they will act accordingly.

FORMER DICTATOR OF VENEZUELA, JIMENEZ

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people were shocked at the shabby treatment accorded Vice President NIXON and Mrs. Nixon during some phases of their recent good-will trip to Latin America. For years we have prided ourselves on maintaining good relations among all the people of the Americas. The Western Hemisphere, at this critical point in history, needs understanding and solidarity more than ever before. The destiny of our Nation and that of all the other nations of the Western Hemisphere has been linked together by a long series of events in the past, many of which characterized the common struggle of the people of the Americas against the encroachments of imperialism, colonialism, despotism, and dictatorship. The association of American States has stood as a symbol for all of the world, expressing a common determination of all the people of the Western Hemisphere to defend the integrity and well-being of the member nations.

Recent events tell us that the long era of harmony and unity which has characterized the relations between the nations of the Western Hemisphere is falling into a state of disrepair. There are undoubtedly a number of basic reasons for this unhappy trend of events. I address myself to only one of those trends about which I have certain and full knowledge. I refer to the presence in the United States of the deposed former dictator of Venezuela who today is vacationing upon the sunny sands of Florida. He has with him an entourage as is the custom of most deposed dictators. Among this entourage is the infamous head of the oppressive police establishment set up by the dictator, Jimenez.

It will be recalled that during the unfortunate incident which attended the visit of the Vice President to Caracas, Venezuela, at a time when a violent attack was made against the very life of the Vice President, the demonstrators carried signs criticizing the United States for allowing the dictator, Jimenez, and his entourage admission into our country. Responsible citizens of Venezuela who are proven friends of the United States have been shocked by our laxity in allowing the deposed dictator who oppressed the people of Venezuela to come into our country where he is now enjoying the liberties and freedoms and physical comforts which he denied to so many loyal and democratic citizens of Venezuela.

Mr. Speaker, I now offer a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the deposed former

dictator of Venezuela, Jimenez, be forthwith removed from our country.

My resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the United States has during its entire history served as a safe haven for the oppressed and persecuted people from many lands; and

Whereas all forms of dictatorship and authoritarian types of governments violate the concepts of individual liberty and human freedom which form the bulwark of our American way of life; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has been required to assume a position of leadership in defense of individual liberty and human freedom throughout a world threatened by tyranny, despotism, and the degrading rule of dictatorship; and

Whereas the American people have made great sacrifices in support of the cause of human freedom and are now being called upon to continue this support; and

Whereas proven friends of the United States who are suffering under an enforced Communist dictatorship and those who but recently have cast off the rule of dictatorship, are confused and shocked at the conduct of the Government of the United States with respect to recently deposed dictators as well as ruthless dictators whose regimes violate all the basic tenets of liberty and justice; and

Whereas the admission into the United States of deposed dictators does violence to our most sacred beliefs, shakes the faith others have in us as leaders of the cause of human freedom, and reduces our prestige among the people of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government should take steps to cause the immediate departure from the United States of the deposed dictator Jimenez and his entire entourage.

FEDERAL CLAIMS AGAINST DEBTORS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on a bill I introduced this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill designed to prevent Federal loans to private persons from jeopardizing the sources of tax revenue of State and local governments, and to provide equitable treatment to creditors of persons indebted to the United States.

The necessity for this legislation has been brought to my attention by a very recent decision in the court of appeals as well as the subject matter of the work of the Banking and Currency Committee for the past 5 weeks. Legislation being considered by the Committee includes bills which would authorize Government agencies to make loans available to municipalities for needed public facilities and to provide equity capital and long-term loans to small business.

The Federal Government in the role of a banker is not new to us, nor undesirable, for Congress has embarked on a policy of permitting Federal agencies to make loans on various types of security for many years. In no area has this policy been more active than in the mortgage market. Some Federal agencies engage directly in the field of lending. Other agencies, such as the Federal Housing Administration, acquire property rights in the exercise of their governmental functions.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that when the United States steps down from its place of sovereignty to enter the domain of business, it should not expect to carry with it its constitutional immunity against taxation and its statutory priority of claims. To illustrate I would like to cite two cases which I believe dramatically describe the problem.

In *United States* v. *Emory* (314 U. S. 423), decided in 1941 and still the prevailing law, the Supreme Court held that in an equity receivership proceeding in a State court, a claim of the United States arising under the National Housing Act is entitled, under the Revised Statutes, section 3466—United States Code, title 31, section 191—to priority over claims for wages.

The provisions of section 3466 have been in force since 1797, without significant modifications—First United States Statutes at Large, page 515. The section provides for a first priority in the United States in all cases, first, in which a debtor, not having sufficient property to pay all his debts, makes a voluntary assignment thereof; or, second, in which the estate and effects of an absconding, concealed, or absent debtor are attached by process of law; or third, in which an act of bankruptcy is committed.

The Emory case involved a claim for wages by workmen from an insolvent corporation. The circuit court of Phelps County, Mo., acting upon a petition filed by Emory, found the corporation insolvent and appointed a receiver who took possession of the corporate assets. Twelve individuals filed wage claims against the assets available for distribution. The United States, on behalf of the Federal Housing Administration, also filed a claim for an amount due on a note which was far in excess of the total amount available for distribution. The note, executed by the corporation to a St. Louis bank, was endorsed and delivered to the FHA under the terms of a contract of insurance and guaranty provided for in title I of the National Housing Act modernization credit plan—when the corporation defaulted. Although the wage claimants asserted priority under Missouri statutes, the United States successfully asserted priority under section 3466 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Is this a desired condition? I do not believe it is. I agree with the dissenting opinion of Justice Reed when he wrote that:

> The intrusion of a novel priority * * *, into the intricate credit system of the Nation at a time of strain, would be a drag on recovery, rather than a stimulus. Suppliers of goods or services in all fields of credit activity would be moved to constrict their advances to a borrower known to have created a secret but valid lien upon his assets superior to all general creditors.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to permit the continuation of this unfair position of the Federal Government when it enters into the normal field of business and commerce, thus jeopardizing the rights of employees, materialmen, and others? Should a note, which in the hands of a bank was in a deferred position to the preferred claims of others, take on a preferred position simply by its being transferred to a Federal agency? Admittedly the majority of the Court said that it should, but at the same time the Court recognized the inequity of the situaion and suggested that any contention to the contrary should be "addressed to Congress and not to this Court." I am today taking advantage of the Court's suggestion and do bring this matter to the attention of the Congress.

I believe State law should determine the priority of all creditors, including the Federal Government in situations like this. Can it be said that our working people and others are in a better position to suffer these losses than is the Federal Government? Labor, materialmen, and other creditors have a right to rely on their own State laws regarding their claims for work done or material supplied to a debtor. They could not be expected to know that this 160-year-old statute permits the Federal Government to override their own bona fide rights. Unfortunately that is what happens and that is why I wish to amend this statute.

Permit me to discuss another aspect of this problem as it relates to the United States claim for priority of payment of a Federal lien, other than a tax lien, over a municipality's subsequent tax lien. A recent case, *The United States* v. *Ringwood Iron Mines, Inc., and the Borough of Ringwood, N. J.* (151 F. Supp. 421, decided May 8, 1957, and 251 Fed. 2d 145, affirmed January 20, 1958).

This case involved a conveyance of certain mining properties sold by the General Services Administration to the Ringwood Iron Mines, Inc. A relatively nominal sum was paid in cash for the property, the balance of the purchase price was a promissory note for $1.4 million collaterally secured by a purchase money mortgage on the subject premises with the General Services Administration as mortgagee. The mortgage was duly recorded. The operation of the mines by the private owner was not too successful and as a result liabilities were incurred which included taxes to the borough. Because of the failure of the corporation to pay real-estate taxes the property was sold at a tax sale to the borough by the local taxing authority. Subsequently the mortgagee—General Services Administration—foreclosed with both the corporation and the borough being named defendants. Shortly after judgment of foreclosure was entered, the property was sold to the General Services Administration. Because of a stipulation joined in by the borough and the United States, which was included in the judgment of foreclosure, the court had to determine whether the tax claims of the borough were cut off by the foreclosure sale.

The court found that section 3466 of the Revised Statutes of the United States was not applicable since the debtor was never found insolvent by it. Nevertheless the court reluctantly held for the United States on the grounds that the

Federal law "does not grant permission to the States to interfere with a lien of the Federal Government by subsequent exercise of their taxing powers." The court in speaking about the activities of the Federal Government in the mortgage market stated:

> I am unable to see how such transactions differ from those between private parties. The explanation of sovereignty appears too unsatisfactory when we see the United States step down from that place of sovereignty to enter the domain of business and commerce.

However, the court found that, in the absence of contrary directions in Federal statutes, a lien in favor of the United States takes precedence over a later lien for municipal taxes.

Again, Mr. Speaker, is this fair to a municipality which provides all of the essential public services which enhances the value of property within its jurisdiction? Why should the Federal Government in the position of a mortgagee of property in private hands have any greater rights and preferences than does a private individual in the position of a mortgagee?

I plan to have the House Banking and Currency Committee consider the bill which I am introducing, and I will recommend that it be included in legislation which will be reported from the committee in the near future. I wish to make it quite clear that I am proposing, under the provisions of my bill, that whenever the United States holds an interest in or a lien upon any property, as security for the payment of a debt owed to it, such interest shall be subordinate to all preferred claims provided by local law in the same manner as local law would apply to a private individual in a similar position.

My bill, however, specifically excludes Federal taxes from the application of its provision. Accordingly, the Federal Government's priority in tax claims would not be disturbed. In this area, quite obviously, very different policy considerations are applicable. It is quite clear that section 3466 of the Revised Statutes plainly states that "debts due the United States shall be first satisfied." However, in other than pure revenue activities of the Federal Government, I do not see either the need or the justification of applying the section. Nor do I see any justification for permitting Federal agencies engaged in business and commerce to claim various immunities that pertain solely to the sovereign operations of the United States. I hope that the House will be favorably disposed to my bill when it is brought before it in the near future.

FARM PRICES AND THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, once again it is necessary to set the record straight on farm prices and the cost of living. With a new barrage of propaganda in recent months, there appears to be an intensified campaign in the slick news magazines to convince consumers that farmers are benefiting from the record high cost of living. I have risen repeatedly to counter these charges with the plain facts of farm economics.

The latest tactics of the divide-and-conquer boys who peddle their political propaganda under the guise of news indicate a new switch in the party line. Now we are being told that agriculture is proving to be a source of strength and a stabilizing force on the economy in a period of recession. Even the Secretary of Agriculture is being quoted in support of this double think theory.

This is happening at a time when many family budgets are being pinched and food prices are still edging up, despite the fact that the farmer is getting less of the food dollar than he ever did.

It is misrepresenting the position of agriculture to suggest that the increase in farm prices from 82 to 87 percent of parity has suddenly put farmers back on their feet financially. It gives housewives the impression that the farmer is responsible for higher food bills. It suggests that the farmer is profiting from a bad economic situation.

The figures of the Department of Agriculture show that this is not the case at all. They show that while farm prices went down, farm costs have stayed up. Costs are now at a record high.

The Department's price experts have assembled some interesting material on how much it takes to run a farm these days. Here are some of the facts about costs:

In the last 10 years farm costs have gone up about 25 percent. When the cost of things that originate on the farm are excluded—such as feed, livestock, and seed—the increase has been 43 percent.

Production has gone up, too. But in spite of all the increase in efficiency on farms, costs per unit of output are 14 percent higher now than they were 10 years ago. Farmers are producing more but the unit cost is greater.

One of the reasons is that agriculture has become a bigger and bigger customer of industry. Farmers have become more dependent upon industry for the materials used in production.

On 21 of the 29 types of farms studied by USDA economists, more than two-thirds of the cash expenditures last year were for goods and services produced off the farm. This was true of only 16 out of the 29 types of farms as recently as 1955.

Net incomes on the 29 types of farms studied by the Department are relatively small. Only 10 out of the 29 had net incomes of $6,000 or more last year.

Wisconsin dairy farms had net incomes of about $3,400 to $3,800. A southeastern Minnesota dairy-hog farm had a net of $4,029 last year. The net of spring wheat farms on the plains to the west of my district ranged from $3,800 to slightly more than $5,000.

The average salary of workers in the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture last year was $6,392. This exceeded the net income of 21 out of the 29 types of farms studied by the Department.

A report in Minnesota Farm Business Notes, a publication of the University of Minnesota, shows that as net farm income has gone down, farm debt has gone up. As a result, the net income earned for each $100 of debt on Minnesota farms last year dropped to $64. In 1951, the net income per $100 of debt was $145—more than double that of last year.

The cost of farmland has increased rapidly in recent years. The present value of farmland is now about nine times the annual net farm income.

As a return on the market value of farmland, the net income of agriculture amounted to only 3 percent last year. This was the lowest rate of return since 1934. The purchasing power of an acre of land has increased since 1940, but the gain has been only half that shown for a representative group of common stocks.

It would take nearly 13 years for the gross return from an acre of Iowa corn land to pay for itself at its current value. This is the largest number of years needed since the depression of the early thirties that it takes for an acre of Iowa corn land to pay for itself.

All of these are facts supplied by the Department of Agriculture. They are available to anyone and they are known by the Secretary of Agriculture.

There may be temporary political advantage in turning housewives against farmers by talking about higher farm prices without regard to the whole truth. I think, however, Mr. Speaker, that it would be better if the slick weeklies would stop trying to outslicker their readers and would devote some time to telling the true facts. This would be a service that would benefit the longtime interests of all of our citizens.

PROHIBIT PAYMENT OF SUBSIDIES TO DOMESTIC TRUNK AIRLINES

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] and I have introduced into the House a bill which would prohibit the payment of subsidy to domestic trunk airlines.

Stated in its simplest terms, the sole purpose of this bill is to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act to bring it up to date with the jet age of air transportation, and to fulfill the intent of the Congress of 20 years ago which created the act and, by so doing, fostered a civil air transport system which has been one of the wonders of the 20th century.

The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 provides a classic example of our Government in following a wise, intelligent course in fostering air transportation in the United States. Under its provisions approximately $200 million has been expended by the Federal Government between 1938 and 1958 in subsidies designed

to develop the finest air transport system in the world.

The bill which we have introduced today would complete the intent of the Congress whose wise decisions have done so much to develop United States air transportation. The policy laid down in 1938 was designed to aid the domestic trunk airlines to obtain a firm start, and to continue to help them until their position was substantially achieved.

That has been done. Most of the domestic trunklines have not received subsidy in the last 6 years. The managements of these carriers are—and should be—proud of this fact. With their own initiative and with the wise provisions of the United States Government they have accomplished what the act of 1938 envisioned.

The legislation of 1938 was enacted by far-sighted men with the best interests of civil aviation and the Nation at heart.

However, the original act contained no provision for a cutoff date which would eliminate Federal subsidies to our air carriers. It was the intent of the Congress at that time to assist the airlines to get off to a firm substantial start, but it was not the intent of Congress that the taxpayers of the United States serve as a continuous financial crutch to the airlines.

The serious need for legislation to establish such a cutoff is exemplified by recent actions before the Civil Aeronautics Board. Although this is 1958—20 years after passage of the original act—several air carriers are applying for Federal subsidies. And this, mind you, not for the purpose of improving the commerce of the United States, but solely for the purpose of staying alive with the assistance of the United States taxpayer. My reading of the record in no wise indicates that such was the purpose of the framers of the original Civil Aeronautics Act.

The legislation which has been introduced today carefully protects and fosters the intent in the original 1938 act. By revising the need section of the present act this legislation would accomplish the following necessary and progressive results:

First. Elimination of the availability of subsidy to trunkline air carriers will eliminate an unnecessary burden of taxation on the general public. Very few other regulated industries are eligible for such direct subsidies as the present law permits the airlines to seek.

Second. Regulation of the domestic airlines and future awards of new routes in the domestic trunkline field would have to be based on much more careful analysis of public need and economic factors affecting present air carriers. It would have the further effect of reducing regional pressures and clamors for services which could not be justified either by public need or sound economics.

Third. It would prevent the public from paying for subsidized competition. The "desire" of an airline to introduce its services on a route where three or four airlines are engaged in intense competition would be considerably cooled by the knowledge it could not fall back on the subsidy crutch in the event of failure.

This legislation does not affect two classes of air carriers. These are the United States international air carriers and the local service air carriers. In the case of the former, where they operate transoceanic routes which may be characterized as "national interest" routes necessary to the carrying out of peaceful United States policy, these carriers continue to be eligible for such subsidies as the Government may deem necessary.

In the case of the local service air carriers whose activities are so essential to many small cities and towns the subsidy program will be continued.

It is inconceivable to me that legislation of the type proposed here will be opposed by the domestic trunk airlines. Most of them have not received subsidy for the last 6 years. Their managements wish to operate them on a good business basis. Given sound, sensible regulatory policies they can accomplish that. These airlines realize that a time must come when subsidy should no longer be available to them. If availability of subsidy continues some of them will continue to seek it, as witness a recent request by one domestic trunkline to the CAB—since withdrawn—for a subsidy of almost $20 million. Mind you, the total subsidy paid to all airlines in fiscal 1939 was only $12,300,000. For the fiscal years 1939 through 1957 approximately $188 million has been made available to these domestic trunklines in the form of subsidy. It is my contention that these figures prove that Congress and the taxpayer have done their part in carrying out the intent of the 1938 Civil Aeronautics Act. The domestic trunklines are now established as transportation businesses as the Congress intended. This is clearly an appropriate time to amend the 1938 Civil Aeronautics Act to eliminate the availability of subsidy to this group of air carriers. They do not need it; it should not be available to them.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, during debate on the mutual-security bill in the Committee of the Whole, I introduced an amendment which would have permitted the use of counterpart funds to establish a commerce of ideas—a kind of research pipeline—between the United States and the world at large.

As you know, this country now has a large and growing surplus of credits in foreign currencies, accumulated from a variety of sources. It is no secret that we have found it difficult to spend these credits constructively without damaging the economies of the nations in which the credits exist.

My proposal would have diverted a fraction of these credits to the most constructive purpose I can imagine. It would have cost our allies nothing, and it would have cost us little more. Yet it would have opened to American scientists and American scholars the bulging intellectual and cultural warehouses of Europe and Asia.

Mr. Speaker, before I took the floor on Wednesday to propose my amendment, I had discussed it in detail with the Department of State and the Library of Congress. In both places I received a warm reception. Mr. Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, believes this plan has enormous possibilities. Under unanimous consent, I introduce his letter of support at this point in the RECORD:

THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1958.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Thank you for asking me to comment on H. R. 11906, a bill to amend the Agricultulture Trade Development and Assistance Act to permit use of counterpart funds derived from sale of surplus agricultural commodities abroad for acquiring significant foreign scholarly works.

I should like to state generally that the objectives of the bill are very commendable, and if it is passed essentially as it stands, it should produce inestimable benefits for the Library of Congress and other research institutions of the country. These benefits could include not only the cost of works acquired but a substantial part of cataloging costs. In almost every large library the resources are inadequate to cope with the prompt cataloging of the influx of publications and valuable material may be inaccessible when it is urgently needed. Cataloging done abroad on counterpart funds would be of great assistance to libraries and, indirectly, to scholarship.

We believe the bill might be improved in one or two respects, and I am pleased to offer these suggestions for your consideration. There may be some question as to whether financing covers the complete cost of acquisition. From time to time, the Library of Congress must send representatives abroad to coordinate exchange arrangements which foreign governments and learned institutions—of which it maintains some 16,000—as well as to discuss purchase arrangements with some of its 220 foreign dealers. At present, the expense of these trips is a charge upon funds provided for purchase of library materials. It would be highly desirable if these and similar costs of acquisition could be covered by counterpart funds. This might be achieved by inserting the expense of services and materials in after "financing" in line 8, page 1, or simply by explaining the intent of "financing" in the report on the bill.

Although certain details of the proposed program cannot be foreseen at this time, it is quite possible that it would be desirable to print or otherwise reproduce abroad certain catalogs, catalog cards, abstracts, etc., and it is considered desirable that the bill also be amended to permit such action.

As you indicate, it would be desirable to have an agency or institution administer certain features of the proposed legislation including the establishment of the machinery to acquire works in foreign countries; to index, abstract, catalog, and translate materials to the extent desired; and to designate research centers which are to be the recipients of materials. You inquire if the Library of Congress might be an appropriate instrumentality for such administration and if there is any precedent for such action by the Library. My answer to both questions is in the affirmative. I have

already referred to the Library's extensive foreign acquisitions program which exceeds that of any other library. Library of Congress cataloging and classification systems serve as a model for many libraries, and our printed catalog cards are widely used, with approximately 29 million cards sold each year to over 9,000 subscribers, including libraries in this country and abroad. The Library's bibliographies and printed catalogs are widely distributed and used abroad as well as in this country.

In the past we have served as the center for a number of cooperative acquisition programs: in 1943–44 as the coordinator of a publications procurement program in cooperation with the Department of State which obtained foreign publications for various Federal agencies and their libraries; in 1945–48 as the center of a Cooperative Acquisitions Project (involving also a cooperative cataloging program) which gathered—through a Library of Congress Mission in Europe—sorted, recorded, and distributed to more than one hundred libraries an estimated 2 million European publications not commercially available during the war years; in 1946–48, as the distributor of nearly 5 million surplus books from the Army and Navy to educational and training institutions for the use of veterans pursuing courses of instruction under the GI Bill of Rights; in 1950–56 in distributing to 30 research libraries over 40,000 Russian duplicates acquired by the Library of Congress; in 1949 as the center for sorting some 365,000 pieces from Japan via the Foreign Documents Branch of the Central Inteligence Agency of which some 33,000 were distributed to other libraries in a cooperative project.

Since World War II, the Library has administered several large-scale projects on funds transferred from the Department of Defense ($3,218,863 in fiscal 1957) to provide analytical, abstracting, and bibliographic services on scientific and technical material, including report literature, as well as other materials in the Library that need to be intensively utilized in undertakings important to the security of the United States and the free world. This and other matters bearing at least indirectly upon the objectives of H. R. 11906 are covered more fully in the attached statement "The Library of Congress as the National Library of Science."

By reason of its experience in cooperative undertakings, and its extensive network of foreign acquisitions the Library would appear to be a natural center for administering the kind of program you envision. Furthermore, I attach so much importance to your proposed program that I would be willing to have the Library of Congress designated as the administering agency. If this suggestion is accepted, you may want to consider authorizing the Library to carry out this task in consultation with such associations and learned societies as it may deem appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

L. QUINCY MUMFORD,
Librarian of Congress.

The Department of State, while indicating reservations about certain technical aspects of my amendment, also declared its enthusisam for the policy and the principle involved.

As you recall, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, as Acting Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, announced that the Committee had examined my amendment and was prepared to accept it as part of their bill.

It was at this point, Mr. Speaker, that a point of order was raised against my amendment and sustained by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

A second and similar amendment was likewise invalidated.

Accordingly, the membership of this House has so far had no chance to consider my proposal on its merits.

However, a bill embodying the identical principle is now pending before the House Agriculture Committee. It is H. R. 11906, an amendment to Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. And I am today introducing another bill, this one changing certain features of the original in line with suggestions by the Department of State.

Briefly, my proposal is this: that the Librarian of Congress be placed in charge of a program to survey books, journals and other materials produced abroad to see if they are worth anything to American scientists and scholars. Such materials as do prove worthwhile would then be put into a form that would allow their use in this country and they would be deposited at American libraries and American research centers for the benefit of American scientists, scholars and students.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is no need to demonstrate the potential worth of this program. During the last 6 months we have heard again and again about the need for communication between American and foreign scientists. We have heard, too, that American education is long on method, weak on content. We have learned, to our sorrow, that we Americans understand too little of the world beyond our borders.

I do not pretend that this program of mine will immediately restore American prestige to its accustomed high. Nor do I pretend that it will magically convert us into the allwise.

There are, however, a number of things it could do about lifting the level of our understanding, about bringing us hard facts and new theories that might otherwise evade us or take a long time to reach us.

Various American scholars who have heard of this plan have written me their enthusiastic endorsement, and I ask unanimous consent to introduce at this point some of the letters I have received. I am certain you will recognize instantly the names of many of these scholars. They are the leading experts in their fields.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF NEAR EASTERN STUDIES,
Ann Arbor, Mich., May 12, 1958.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DINGELL: In the most emphatic terms at my command, I respectfully urge immediate action on and the passage of H. R. 11906, which would permit counterpart funds, obtained from the sale of agricultural surplus commodities abroad (Public Law 480), to be used in part for the purchase, translation, cataloging, etc., of significant books of foreign scholars in the sciences and the humanities.

Every academic program in the United States dealing with a foreign area, and every instructor in either a small or a large institution teaching subjects about foreign areas, must have—for both himself and his students—scholarly works produced in those areas. For example, the Near Eastern Program at the University of Michigan desperately needs to expand its library holdings by acquiring significant works in Arabic, Persian, Turkish, and Hebrew.

Lamentably, no institution of learning, large or small, has either the funds, the ability, or—because it is so far removed from the foreign area of its concern—the opportunity to make the requisite purchases. The proposal contained in H. R. 11906 has, therefore, the greatest possible merit.

Permit me to observe that this act, whereby the Library of Congress would serve as the center for the purchases made from part of the counterpart funds, would vastly improve the facilities for instruction in almost every small college and institution of learning in this country, as well as the large universities where—as at the University of Michigan, there are one or more area programs (those at this institution are devoted to the Near East, the Far East, and Russia). For there are today, even in such small colleges as Antioch (Ohio), Earlham (Ind.), and Albion (Mich.), hundreds of historians, or political scientists, or specialists in other disciplines, teaching the future leaders of America in such subjects as "The International Relations of India and its Neighbors", or "The Art of the Moslem World", or "The Cultures of Indonesia", or Arabic, or Hindi, or Japanese. Both these scholars and their thousands of students must have the books and other cultural items of these areas if they are to become acquainted with the peoples, cultures, letters, and sciences of these foreign areas.

Permit me also to observe that we in such area programs as the Program in Near Eastern Studies at the University of Michigan (see the accompanying brochure) will be delighted to cooperate as consultants, without fee, with the Library of Congress on such a worthwhile and needed undertaking. Indeed, I would be happy if this suggestion, that the Library of Congress be requested to make such consultation, were written into the bill.

In brief, I feel sincerely that the proposal contained in H. R. 11906 will vastly benefit the present and future citizens of these United States, will improve cultural relations all over the world, and hence will contribute to the well-being and the peace of mankind.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE G. CAMERON,
Chairman.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE,
Ann Arbor, May 12, 1958.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Reprsentatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: I was glad to learn that your amendment, H. R. 11906, to the agriculture surplus disposal program, provides a means for the use of counterpart funds for the purchase, translation, and cataloging of significant scholarly works in both the sciences and the humanities, to be administered through the Library of Congress.

There is no question that American scholarship in all fields of academic endeavor has gained immensely through the Fulbright program, which also makes use of counterpart funds. It is evident, however, that only a small proportion of our scholars, both present and potential, can hope to take advantage of this program. The next best thing is to make as much scholarly and cultural material available to those who, for the present, must remain at home. Exchanges of material as well as personnel are calculated to serve the same end, namely to help overcome the insularity of American academic life and to bring the intellectual achievements of other parts of the world to bear more directly upon ours.

I view the purchase and translation of cultural and scholarly materials of particularly great importance at a time when we must expand to the utmost our facilities for

higher education. New colleges are springing up all over the country; old ones are expanding. Scores, indeed hundreds of these are without adequate library facilities, especially with respect to the acquisition of foreign materials. Building up a library in these areas is difficult in the face of limited funds and facilities. Your proposed amendment will make the task much easier.

Moreover, the present needs of our country demand constant and renewed emphasis upon the study of foreign languages and foreign cultures. This is unquestionably best accomplished through language and area programs. I note particularly that H. R. 11906 is designed to improve the library facilities of colleges and universities specializing in area studies. This seems to me to be precisely where the emphasis is needed.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. MACKWARDT,
Professor of English; Vice President, Linguistic Society of America.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,
Syracuse, N. Y., May 13, 1958.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
New House Office Building
Washington, D. C

DEAR MR. DINGELL: A brief but extremely significant bill, H. R. 11906 (85th Cong., 2d sess.) calling for an amendment to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

It provides for the use of counterpart funds derived from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities abroad for acquiring significant foreign scholarly works.

It seems to me to be a highly advantageous bill assuring a return for our commodities of an invaluable asset quite likely otherwise to remain unobtainable. The scholarly wisdom of the ages is an exportable commodity from abroad which cannot help but strengthen America. It is at an expense of funds which will most likely be written off as unrecoverable if not used in some such way as H. R. 11906 provides.

I would appreciate having your interest in this.

Cordially yours,

WILLIAM P. TOLLEY.

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
New Haven, Conn., May 12, 1958.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter of May 6, 1958 regarding your proposed amendment, H. R. 11906, on the subject of the agricultural surplus disposal program. In expressing my approval of the purposes of your amendment, I wish to state that I speak strictly on my own behalf and not as the voice of the American Oriental Society of which I happen to be secretary. My organization is a purely scholarly organization which does not undertake on principle to influence legislation.

I believe that the amendment you propose would be of great benefit to libraries of American institutions both in the sciences and the humanities. I am convinced that there are many such institutions where personnel is available and anxious to carry on research. The desire, however, is often discouraged because of the lack of library facilities and this in turn is due to the lack of funds with which to purchase materials necessary for such research. In my own rather limited field in humanistic studies I am fortunate enough to be associated with a library which has adequate materials. As administrator of a small section of this library I frequently have requests from scholars in other institutions to borrow some rare publication on interlibrary loan. Such requests sometimes must be rejected because the materials desired are in active use in our own library. A program such as you propose would help alleviate this situation.

I feel sure that most other members of my organization would feel individually just as I do on this subject, and I have no doubt that people involved in research in all aspects of humanistic studies as well as the physical sciences would be very much pleased to have such a program put into effect.

In recent years the United States has taken a position of political leadership among the nations of the world. In a somewhat lesser degree it is slowly becoming a cultural and educational leader. Our position of leadership in the world cannot be expected to be maintained unless the political and economic aspects of it are balanced by leadership in the cultural realm. This means that more and more young Americans must devote themselves to research in the sciences and the humanities. Research cannot be carried on without proper materials. Therefore, your proposal to make such materials more accessible is of great significance to the national welfare.

Yours sincerely,

FERRIS J. STEPHENS.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF ORIENTAL STUDIES,
Princeton, N. J., May 8, 1958.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: I hasten to reply to your letter of May 6 and to extend my congratulations to you for the introduction of H. R. 11906 as an amendment to Public Law 480, since I so heartily approve of the intent.

I would like to put myself on record in the strongest terms in support of this amendment for I believe that it could do a great deal toward filling a gap in American education in the discharging of our responsibility to our youth and citizenry in regard to an adequate knowledge of peoples in Asia and Africa.

It is difficult to secure sufficient funds, not to mention the means, to be able to bring to the United States the materials needed for research in Asian and African studies, but beyond that, the prospect of having many of these works—translated or abstracted—is a boon which would excite any scholar in this field.

This strong endorsement and support comes from me first, as an interested citizen; second, as a scholar, interested in the area; third, as the director of the pioneer area student program in Near Eastern studies in higher education in the United States; and fourth, as Chairman of the Near East Committee of the Social Science Research Council.

In this last named capacity I have been working for a year and a half or more to create a system for the identification and acquisition of bibliographical materials from countries in the Middle East and determine the most expeditious way in which these services can be centralized in the United States for the use of citizens, scholars and institutions interested in the area. Were the amendment H. R. 11906 the law now, I am sure that this would be a major and important step toward the realization of the goal toward which we as a Committee have been working.

As a matter of fact tomorrow, May 9, this Committee meets in New York for consideration of a final report on this whole subject. I shall make it a part of the agenda to acquaint the members of the Committee with this pending legislation, and will see to it that each of them writes you on the subject. It may be possible, if it conforms to the policy of the Social Science Research Council, to send you an endorsement in the name of the Committee as a whole. This is the one national Committee in higher education at the moment charged responsibility with the task of developing Near Eastern studies throughout the country.

Sincerely yours,

T. CUYLER YOUNG, *Chairman.*

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH,
Syracuse, N. Y., May 9, 1958.

The Honorable JOHN DINGELL,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: May I express my hearty approval of the bill which you are sponsoring, H. R. 11906 "To amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act to permit use of counterpart funds derived from sale of surplus agricultural commodities abroad for acquiring significant foreign scholarly works." It seems to me very well designed to further the important objectives of increasing American knowledge of foreign countries and of manifesting to these countries our desire to know more about their cultures and ways of life.

Yours sincerely,

SANFORD B. MEECH,
Chairman.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO,
Buffalo, N. Y., May 5, 1958.

The Honorable JOHN DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The H. R. 11906 is so eminently sensible, for all agencies and parties concerned, that I am only sorry that it has not been brought forward years ago and in action.

It will certainly help our resources and universities and scholarships and thinking to "grow up" and that without injuring anybody in the growing process.

Best wishes to you and to the success of the bill for the inconvertible foreign currencies.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. HEINDEL,
Vice Chancellor, Professor of History and Government.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
CHAPTER, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS,
May 15, 1958.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: The following resolutions were passed by the Executive Committee of the Syracuse University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors on May 14, 1958:

"*Resolved,* That the Syracuse University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors through its Executive Committee warmly supports the bill called H. R. 11906 (85th Cong., 2d sess.; referred to the House Committee on Agriculture), to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act to permit use of counterpart funds derived from sale of surplus agricultural commodities abroad, for abstracting, translating, and acquiring significant scholarly works. Our university faculties are greatly interested in having such material available in this country; further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the sponsor of the bill, Representative JOHN DINGELL, to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, HAROLD D. COOLEY, to Senator IRVING M. IVES, Senator JACOB JAVITS, Representative R. WALTER RIEHLMAN."

Sincerely yours,

FLORENCE R. VANHOESEN,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, a somewhat similar plan has been introduced in the other body by Senator HUMPHREY. I hope that it will receive as warm a reception there as I am certain it will be accorded here.

This program should be put into effect as quickly as possible, on as large a scale as possible. The dollar cost will be negligible, the benefit enormous.

Mr. Speaker, if a man kindles his candle from my candle he increases his light without diminishing mine.

We have an opportunity here to construct a pipeline for ideas between the old world and the new—to the benefit of both. I ask your support.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman be kind enough to tell us what the program will be regarding Memorial Day? Will the House adjourn in time for Members to go back to their districts for Memorial Day?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the intention that there will be no meeting of the House on Memorial Day. The gentlewoman asks about Members being able to get back to their districts on Memorial Day. That is a question that projects us into Thursday of next week, to say the least, and it is a matter for each Member to determine and a matter which the gentleman from Massachusetts is unable to determine at this time. It is the intention, of course, as always to respect the observance of Memorial Day by not being in session. Further than that, I cannot go and the gentlewoman understands that I am unable to make any promise in connection with that at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Many Members have very early Memorial Day services to attend.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts knows that I always try to do everything I can to accommodate the membership and I appreciate the problems that my colleagues have and always try to give them the maximum consideration possible.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, I know that very well without asking the gentleman so far as that is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. So far as the legislative program for the future is concerned, we have the statehood bill which is now pending. Then we have the reciprocal trade agreements bill. There is the Defense Department appropriation bill and the Army reorganization bill which has been reported out of the committee. There is the outer space bill which has been reported out of committee. At this time of the year, the situation becomes rather difficult and there is not that leeway or flexibility which we might otherwise have. You will only prolong this session of the Congress by delaying final disposition of all these matters that must be considered by the Congress. Of course, I will do the best I can, as I always have. As I said before, the House will not meet on Friday. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has that information and she is the first one who has received it publicly, but I cannot give any promises about Thursday in view of the very heavy legislative schedule which confronts us.

PUPPIES AND CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Everyone in the United States is fond of dogs, especially children, little boys, and elderly people. Puppies and children are so often associated together. Recently there appeared in the Boston Herald an article by Rudolph Elie dealing with the subject of puppies and dogs. It is of such universal interest that I ask unanimous consent to extend it as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

HARKING BACK WITH RUDOLPH ELIE

SHE'LL GROW UP? SHE BETTER HAD

The puppy is out there now, sprawled flat on the kitchen floor and dreaming perhaps of dog yummies, fresh bones, and the chase. You'd think to look at her that she is some kind of a shaggy angel. But she isn't. She's a terror, a clumsy, reckless, silly, voracious, lovable terror, and the moment of her waking is an event to be dreaded.

She'll want to go out, of course, but once out she will want to come in again. Can't puppies ever be on the right side of a door? Certainly, they say, wait until she grows up.

In or out she'll find a pair of socks to chew, and she may even swallow them and so frighten everyone but herself to death. Yet down they go and, miraculously enough, down they stay. She loves socks best of all, though any item of laundry will do, especially expensive ones, like lace tablecloths. But she'll eat anything: broadloom rugs, rungs of chairs gnawed off with splintering crunches, shoe strings, old baseball gloves, sugar off the table from its presumably safe place in the middle, dirt, mud, roots, garbage (what a delight), everything. But change the regular ingredients of her formal meals, and will she eat that? She will in time, they say.

So we've been told

Will she ever learn to greet people except by climbing over them and pawing their clothes and lapping their cheeks and knocking them off balance and tripping up, all the while wriggling and bounding and knocking over chairs, tables, cigarette trays and everything else? That's what they say.

Will she ever learn to sit when commanded to do so, or to stay or to heel or to come back on the shrill call of her name? Will she ever stop startling old ladies or terrifying little children with the tongue of a rasp-rough file, or to keep from jumping up on strangers? Will she ever learn not to go charging at strange dogs as if they were her sisters and not—as she sometimes finds out—surly and hostile mongrels? So we've been told.

Will she ever stop scratching out monumental holes in the garden, or clawing up the iris bulbs or digging caverns under the steps for people to fall into? Or refrain from wanting to chase cats, or keep out of the way of rakes, hoes, saws, hammers, or any other tools being employed in her vicinity? Or learn not to get into places she can't get out of, or to keep from whimpering like some poor lost soul if she is left behind in the car for 10 minutes? Everybody says she will.

Will she ever sleep where she's supposed to, or keep out from under foot, or be wholly reliable about her duties, or shake out the water in her coat save in everyone's face? Or stop wanting to roll in the most awful smelling things, or stop wanting to sniff at every curb, every post, every bush, every corner, every tree? Give her a little more time, they say.

She's only a puppy

Will she ever stop being an expense for shots, for leashes, for collars, for licenses, for veterinarians, for fancy feeding bowls, for yummies, for sleeping mats on which she won't sleep, for books of instruction, for brushes and insect powders and pills and potions? Sure, she's only a puppy, isn't she.

Will she ever cease being an endless topic of conversation—not to say argument—about the proper way to train her, to feed her, to groom her, and to teach her anything, not to say to determine who is supposed to do what and when in connection with such activities? Of course, what can you expect at her age?

So she's out there now on the kitchen floor, sprawled flat and happy right where everyone will trip over her, and now her eyes are open. She'll be up in a minute and there will be hell to pay. But who cares?

Let her wag her tail and cock her head and melt into a pile of fur on the floor when she's scratched behind the ears, and what's a little confusion among friends? She'll grow up someday. Everyone says so, anyway.

INADEQUATE PROVISIONS OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT FAIL TO PROTECT MASSACHUSETTS TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this morning I went to the Rules Committee to ask if they would grant an open rule making the Dorn-Simpson bill in order rather than the bill which came out of the Ways and Means Committee extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I have always felt that tariffmaking and the setting of duties, under the Constitution, belonged to the Congress of the United States. I think we have fared very badly in some ways and unfairly under the present system.

I wanted to ask also if a rule were granted for the Ways and Means Committee whether the rule would allow amendments, if not open to general amendment whether provision could be made for an amendment that would substitute the Dorn-Simpson bill, which is a much more equitable bill, in my opinion.

My own district would be irreparably hurt through a continuation of the reciprocal trade agreements program, particularly so far as cotton velveteen imports from Japan are concerned. We thought we had been given some relief from Japanese imports, but they do not stay within their limits.

It is a horrible thing to see people lose their jobs, their bread and butter, and see no future because of foreign competition.

Japan has not lived up to her quota. We hear so much talk about relief to be had under the escape clause, peril point, and so forth, but in my experience things do not work out that way.

THE FORTHCOMING ELECTIONS IN ITALY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on next Sunday and Monday, the citizens of Italy will go to the polls to choose a national government that will continue Italy's progress under freedom. That election will be bad news for Moscow. It will demonstrate the decline of Communist influence, and it will be an emphatic expression by the Italian people of their faith in democracy.

Italy voted to become a republic in 1946.

After the desolation and suffering of World War II, the native Communists saw an opportunity to exploit this misery, and use it as a springboard to power. The Italian people were not fooled. Centuries of civilization had developed an individuality in the Italians that, in spite of their serious economic position, resisted the false promises of communism. Those who would betray Italy were defeated.

The encouragement that Italians received from the millions of their relatives in the United States and throughout the Free World, played a key role in that contest. In one of the most remarkable letter-writing campaigns in history, Italian-Americans in the United States told their relatives in the old country of the great opportunities for human development that they had found in their adopted land; and of the same opportunities that will be found in Italy under the stimulating climate of a free society.

Again, we are sending a message of hope and confidence to the Italian people, as they prepare to vote on Sunday and Monday in an election that will have far-reaching consequences.

This time, our expression of faith in them is reinforced by their own experience and progress since the last national election.

The genius of the Italian people has asserted itself. Italy is making an impressive comeback. The Communists, who sought to profit from the misery of war, have seen their moment of opportunity vanish.

Italy still has problems, but she is solving them in the democratic way that rejects enslavement by the state for the material progress that devours all personal and human rights.

We are happy to see Italy on the right road.

We are pleased with the improving standard of living in a country to which we owe so much for her spiritual, cultural, and democratic gifts to humanity.

All Americans, no matter what their racial origin may be, unite in sending greetings to the Italian people on the eve of their national election.

We are convinced that they will ballot the Communists into a decisive defeat from which they will never recover.

WHAT ABOUT EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS FOR THE RAILROADER?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 the House of Representatives passed H. R. 12065, authorizing temporary unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit right under existing State unemployment compensation laws.

The request for the extension of unemployment compensation benefits in President Eisenhower's message to Congress on March 25 not only included unemployed persons in covered employment under the State unemployment compensation system, but also the unemployed railroader covered by the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Thus, the bill the House passed on May 1 and sent to the Senate did not include unemployed railroaders.

Mr. Speaker, railroad employment in the United States as of February 15 of this year dropped to 861,928, the lowest in 70 years. This was a loss of 125,197 jobs as compared with February of 1957. Since last February the number of unemployed in the railroad industry has constantly been increasing as jobs are being abolished because of depressed conditions.

As of May 1, 1958, according to the Railroad Retirement Board which administers the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, there were in excess of 143,000 unemployed railroaders drawing unemployment benefits. Already, nearly 40,000 of this number have exhausted their eligibility for benefits. By July 1 another 55,000 will suffer the same fate. As each month goes by additional thousands will lose their right to unemployment insurance benefits.

Mr. Speaker, in my Congressional District in Pennsylvania we have nearly 15,000 unemployed and over half of them are unemployed railroaders. The majority of them live in Altoona and vicinity and the remainder in the DuBois-Clearfield-Osceola Mills area.

In this central Pennsylvania area over a thousand of these unemployed railroaders have already exhausted their unemployment benefits, and the number will increase monthly. The situation has been serious for several months, and it becomes more acute as the days go by.

It is common knowledge that the average weekly benefit an unemployed railroader receives is $40. When you consider that he has not had steady employment for years because of frequent furloughs, his economic plight becomes plainly evident. When he loses his unemployment insurance benefits, he is without any income from any source.

Mr. Speaker, recently when in my Congressional District I talked to many unemployed railroaders whose unemployment insurance benefits had terminated. In each instance, they had families, their homes were partially paid for, their savings were exhausted, and monthly bills for the necessities of life had to be paid. In short, these men are truly desperate as they reveal their pathetic circumstances.

The only recourse these unemployed railroaders have, unless railroad unemployment insurance benefits are extended, is to apply for State public assistance. To be eligible for such benefits it is required that they convert to cash all assets, such as insurance policies or savings bonds, and in addition give to the State of Pennsylvania a lien on their partially paid for homes.

Mr. Speaker, conscious of the sad plight of unemployed railroaders in my Congressional District, as early as March 11, I introduced H. R. 11338 designed to extend railroad unemployment insurance benefits from the present 26-week period to 39 weeks, or a total of 13 weeks. This bill was introduced several weeks in advance of President Eisenhower's message to Congress requesting extension of State unemployment compensation benefits and railroad unemployment insurance benefits. My bill, H. R. 11338, was referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, together with other bills on the subject, where no action has been taken or scheduled at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress cannot in good conscience dare to discriminate against unemployed railroaders. We have taken care of their neighbors in other industries covered by the State unemployment compensation laws, and in simple justice to unemployed railroaders it is imperative that they receive equal treatment by extending railroad unemployment insurance benefits without further delay.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have a recollection that the representatives of the railroad employees did not want to be included in the bill that was reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means. I have not heard from them, and I would welcome their views as to what they have in mind. Usually they contact me, because the relationship between the representatives of the employees and myself throughout the years has been very friendly. I felt it a little strange that I had not heard from them, but my distinct recollection is that they did not want to be included in the bill reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means. Now, if they are interested in some other avenue, I would welcome hearing from them.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. What the gentleman from Massachusetts has said is true about the bill which already passed the

House and is now pending in the Senate. They did not want to be identified with that bill because it covered another phase of employment in the United States. However, since then representatives of railway labor unions in my home town of Altoona, Pa., have been in Washington and contacted me and asked me to insist on Congressional action on the bill that I introduced last March.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ALLEN of California (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for May 22, 1958, on account of official business.

To Mrs. GRANAHAN (at the request of Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania), on account of illness.

To Mr. HASKELL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 2 days, May 22–23, on account of illness.

To Mr. DOYLE, until June 5, 1958, on account of official business in California.

To Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 6 days, May 23 through May 30, on account of official business as Congressional Delegate to World Health Assembly in Minnesota.

To Mr. SAUND (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for today, the balance of the week and until June 4, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MAY, for 20 minutes, on Tuesday, May 27.

Mr. SHEEHAN, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, May 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. FEIGHAN in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. FOGARTY in five instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. MAY and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. CEDERBERG and to include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING in two instances, in each to include related matter.

Mr. LIPSCOMB and to include related matter.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. DIXON) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. CRAMER.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 143. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Fricano, Maria Sceiba Fricano, Stefano Fricano, and Vincenzo (Jimmy) Fricano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 445. An act for the relief of Maria Sabatino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 459. An act for the relief of Francisco Salinas (also known as Daniel Castro Quilantan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 683. An act for the relief of Chiu-Sang Wu and his wife, Catherine Naoko Mitsuda Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1191. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange lands at Olympic National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1234. An act for the relief of Benjamin Barron-Wragon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1542. An act for the relief of Lori Biagi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1593. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Lesch and her minor children, Gonda, Norbert, and Bobby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1939. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act of August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1963. An act to amend section 35 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to increase the punishment for knowingly giving false information concerning destruction of aircraft and motor vehicles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2215. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2511. An act for the relief of Maria Garcia Aliaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2816. An act for the relief of Concepcion Ramiro (Romelio) Gamboa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2944. An act for the relief of Yoshiko Matsuhara and her minor child, Kerry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2965. An act for the relief of Taeko Takamura Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2982. An act for the relief of Kalliope Giamnias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3055. An act for the relief of Ronald H. Denison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3060. An act for the relief of Romulo A. Manriquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3076. An act to amend section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, relating to research on foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3080. An act for the relief of Kimiko Araki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3129. An act for the relief of Nativadade Agrela Dos Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3136. An act for the relief of Fouad (Fred) Kassis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3159. An act for the relief of Cresencio Urbano Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3172. An act for the relief of Ryfka Bergmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3173. An act for the relief of Prisco Di Flumeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3175. An act for the relief of Giuseppina Fazio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3176. An act for the relief of Teofilo M. Palaganas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3205. An act for the relief of Paul S. Watanabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3269. An act for the relief of Mildred (Milka Krivec) Chester; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3271. An act for the relief of Souhail Wadi Massad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3272. An act for the relief of Janez (Garantini) Bradek and Franciska (Garantini) Bradek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3307. An act to reinstate certain terminated oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Interior in Insular Affairs.

S. 3358. An act for the relief of John Demetriou Asteron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3364. An act for the relief of Antonios Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3478. An act to insure the maintenance of an adequate supply of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3861. An act to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution extending greetings to the citizens of Nevada concerning the celebration of the centennial of the discovery of silver in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of the hearings entitled "Civil Rights—1957," for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1342. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Harvey;

H. R. 1466. An act for the relief of Dr. Thomas B. Meade;

H. R. 2763. An act for the relief of Hong-to Dew;

H. R. 4215. An act amending sections 22 and 24 of the Organic Act of Guam;

H. R. 4445. An act for the relief of the estate of Mr. Shirley B. Stebbins;

H. R. 5836. An act to establish a postal policy, to adjust postal rates, to adjust the compensation of postal employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6176. An act for the relief of Fouad George Baroody;

H. R. 6528. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lyman C. Murphey;

H. R. 6731. An act for the relief of Harry Slatkin;

H. R. 6765. An act to provide for reports on the acreage planted to cotton, to repeal the prohibition against cotton acreage reports based on farmers' planting intentions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7203. An act for the relief of Dwight J. Brohard;

H. R. 7645. An act to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations contained in instrument conveying certain land by the United States to the State of Wisconsin;

H. R. 8039. An act for the relief of Edward L. Munroe;

H. R. 8071. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey an easement over certain property of the United States located

in Princess Anne County, Va., known as the Fort Story Military Reservation, to the Norfolk Southern Railway Co. in exchange for other lands and easements of said company;

H. R. 8433. An act for the relief of Capt. Laurence D. Talbot (retired);

H. R. 8448. An act for the relief of Willie C. Williams;

H. R. 9012. An act for the relief of Alexander Grossman;

H. R. 9109. An act for the relief of John A. Tierney;

H. R. 9362. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to Post 924, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States;

H. R. 9395. An act for the relief of Cornelia V. Lane;

H. R. 9490. An act for the relief of Sidney A. Coven;

H. R. 9514. An act for the relief of Valleydale Packers, Inc.;

H. R. 9738. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., a parcel of land in the said city of Macon containing five and thirty-nine one-hundredths acres, more or less;

H. R. 9775. An act for the relief of William J. McGarry;

H. R. 9991. An act for the relief of Felix Garcia;

H. R. 9992. An act for the relief of James R. Martin and others; and

H. J. Res. 586. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of the week beginning on October 13, 1958, as National Olympic Week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 23, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1947. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1959, involving an increase of $1,698,100, of which $431,600 is to be paid from Federal funds and $1,266,500 from District funds, for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 387); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1948. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the month of April relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1949. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to certain medals"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1950. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the assistance program for Vietnam for the fiscal years 1955 through 1957, as administered by the International Cooperation Administration under the mutual-security program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1951. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the case of Kuo Cheng Wu and his wife, Edith Huang Wu, pursuant to section 13 (c) of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1952. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines by providing for stabilization payments to producers of ores or concentrates of these commodities"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1953. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report by the Department of the Interior on its findings and conclusions based upon an examination of the competitive status of the domestic yellowfin, skipjack, and bigeye tuna fishery, pursuant to section 9 (b) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 573. Resolution for consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 5836, to readjust postal rates and to establish a Congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1762). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. S. 2224. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding advertised and negotiated disposals of surplus property; with amendment (Rept. No. 1763). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 11133. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1764). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 12541. A bill to promote the national defense by providing for reorganization of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1765). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of the Special Study Mission to Canada. (Rept. No. 1766.) Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 614. Joint resolution to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1767). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 12628. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to extend for an additional 3-year period the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 12629. A bill to amend title IV of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to provide for certain overseas programs relating to scientific and other significant works; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 12630. A bill to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 12631. A bill to amend section 772 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of the military department concerned shall furnish appropriate uniforms (including insignia) to holders of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 12632. A bill authorizing Gus A Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 12633. A bill to amend section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, so as to eliminate authority for the payment of subsidies for domestic trunk air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 12634. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 12635. A bill to amend section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, so as to eliminate authority for the payment of subsidies for domestic trunk air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 12636. A bill to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide a conclusive presumption of service-connection in the case of the death of certain World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 12637. A bill to provide for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of moderate-income families, to provide liberalized credit to reduce the cost of housing for such families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. R. 12638. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small business by providing a limited deduction for additional investment in depreciable property or inventory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 12639. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to provide equitable treatment of creditors of persons indebted to the United States, to prevent Federal loans to private persons from jeopardizing the tax revenues of State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 12640. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of Philadelphia, Pa., certain piers and other facilities of the United States located in such city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H. R. 12641. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify the definition of "rayon or other synthetic textile"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 12642. A bill to clarify section 106 (f) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to the making of relocation payments for displacements caused by programs of voluntary repair and rehabilitation in connection

with urban renewal projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 12643. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia', to create 'The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia', and for other purposes", approved April 1, 1942, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 12644. A bill to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide an additional defense allowance to aid in the construction of superliner passenger vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. R. 12645. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to provide that all the income of any minor member of a family shall be excluded in determining the eligibility of such family for admittance to and continued occupancy of low-rent housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 12646. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of Philadelphia, Pa., certain piers and other facilities of the United States located in such city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 12647. A bill for the relief of the county of Orange, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 12648. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Veterans' Administration hospital in southern New Jersey; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 12649. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act, and to approve amendments of the Hawaiian land laws in regard to sales, leasing, and exchange of public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 12650. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GUBSER (by request):

H. R. 12651. A bill to amend title V of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide for the furnishing of clothing and other wearing apparel to veterans to replace clothing and other wearing apparel damaged as a result of falls due to service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 12652. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the disclosure of certain retirement information; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Con. Res. 332. Concurrent resolution relative to the establishment of plans for the peaceful exploration of outer space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. Con. Res. 333. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the size of the Army National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 334. Concurrent resolution relative to the establishment of plans for the peaceful exploration of outer space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. Res. 574. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government should take steps to cause the immediate departure from the United States of the deposed dictator Jimenez and his entire entourage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly entitled, "Resolution memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, and Congress with respect to the proposed layoff of civilian employees from the United States Naval Air Station at Quonset Point, R. I. and the United States Naval Underwater Ordnance Station at Newport, R. I."; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 12653. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Yoshimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 12654. A bill for the relief of Antonia Fanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 12655. A bill for the relief of S. Jackson & Son, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 12656. A bill for the relief of Alma Kreislers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Missouri:

H. R. 12657. A bill for the relief of Harry E. Brockman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 12658. A bill for the relief of Richard Leong (also known as Leong Kwon Jow); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 12659. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mathilde Ringol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 12660. A bill for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Tighe Crespo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 12661. A bill for the relief of Abdel Hafiz Husein Farraj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

637. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Valley Economic Development Association, Sayre, Pa., urging the legislative bodies to consider prompt and favorable action to eliminate such regulations as have endangered the very existence of our great transportation system, and urging the establishment of regulations that will permit the railroads to operate on a fair competitive basis without delay; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

638. By Mr. REUSS: Petition of the Milwaukee Mailers Union No. 23 to the Congress protesting activities contrary to the provisions of the Labor-Management Act of 1947 carried on by the administration of the act. In addition, the petition protests "the unwarranted persecutions of the International Typographical Union by the National Labor Relations Board"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Appropriate Uniforms for Medal of Honor Winners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1958

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce in the House of Representatives today a bill to amend section 772 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Government furnish to Congressional Medal of Honor winners appropriate uniforms, including insignia.

I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that these Medal of Honor winners are asked at least 6 to 8 times a year to participate in civic events, such as Armed Forces Day, Memorial Day, Veterans Day, Medal of Honor conventions, conventions of various organizations, dedications, and other commendable affairs.

Most of these men have been out of the service for years and they do not have uniforms suitable for these occasions. It is highly appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that these men of valor, who have earned the highest recognition within the gift of a grateful Nation, be outfitted with the necessary uniforms to wear at the many public functions which they are expected to attend.

This would be done by authorizing the Secretary of the service involved to furnish, upon request and not more often than once every 5 years, an appropriate uniform, including insignia, without charge.

Approximately 340 men upon whom the Nation's highest military honor was bestowed are still living. They are, Mr. Speaker, symbols of the highest traditions of bravery and devotion of the armed services. This is not, I emphasize, a matter of money. Rather, it is a matter of acknowledging our eternal debt to these brave men.

After all, Mr. Speaker, when the holder of a Congressional Medal of Honor is asked to appear at some public meeting, he alone is not being honored. Rather, all of the armed services and the men and women who comprise them are being honored.